

2

THE
CASE

TRULY
STATED;

Wherein the
CASE Restated
Is fully CONSIDER'D.

By a Member of the Church of England.

1 Pet. III. 15. *But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts, and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear:*

L O N D O N :

Printed for George Strahan at the Golden Ball over against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1714.

CASTLE

TRULY

STATED;

Which the

CASTLE

is fully CONSIDER'D.

By a Member of the Church of England.

1 Pet. III. 17. But chiefly the Lord God is your
 heart, and he ready always to give an answer to
 every man that seeks for a revelation of the hope that
 is in you, with meekness and fear:

L O N D O N.

Printed for George Sturaban at the Golden
 Ball over against the Royal Exchange in
 Cornhill. 1714.

*The CASE truly Stated ; or a
Vindication of the Case Sta-
ted, &c.*

Vindicator. **S**INCE you have been pleased, Sir, to give your self the Trouble of looking over the CASE STATED, with your Popish Friend, I presume it may be no Offence to beg, that you will be so kind as to survey it once more, or rather your Friends Reflections upon it, together with a Member of the Church of *England*, who I assure you means neither you, nor any one else Harm ; and who earnestly desires to be serviceable to you to the best Purposes, as *the Author of the Case stated* also did ; I mean in order to your Temporal, and much rather to your Eternal Interest.

Restater. Such Kindness as this is what every one ought highly to value. And could I possibly hope to reap any Advantage by a Review of that *Conversation, between the Lord and the Gentleman*, I should be glad to go over it again and again, till you were quite tired with it. But to deal plainly with you, by what I have seen of it already, I despair of its having any good effect upon me, or any one else that considers it carefully and impartially.

Vind. Do not be so positive. I hope you may find your self mistaken in this Supposition, as fond as you are of it,

Rest. Then, if you please, let us try.

Vind. With all my Heart. And may the Almighty graciously direct our Understandings, that we may discern the Truth, and sincerely embrace and adhere to it.

Rest. Will you please then to begin.

Vind. I forbear to enquire what ^{*} extreme Satisfaction you profess to have had, in reading the *Case Stated*, and what Expectation you would be thought to have entertained, of its bringing your Popish Friend to renounce a superstitious Religion, prejudicial to his Interests, both in this World, and in the next. In this I cannot persuade my self, that you expect, or even desire to be believed; but doubt rather that you love that Superstitious, and indeed Idolatrous Religion too well, to think of parting with it upon whatever account.

Rest. This is not to the Point we are upon, of the *Case Stated*.

Vind. But it certainly is to the point of your Sincerity. However I let it pass, and proceed to the first Section of your Letter; where it is observable, you silently pass over what is urged in the *Case Stated*, as to the Hope of Salvation in the Church of England.

I. Rest. Pray how do you mean? I say, † you see, Sir, your Authors first Paragraph. Can there be any thing more shamefully unjust? What Roman Catholick ever denied Jerusalem to be the Mother Church, &c.

Vind. I am very sensible you do say it; but that is what I complain of, that you call this the first Paragraph, whereas there is certainly another before it; and such an one, as well deserved your Consideration. Pray, my Lord, says our Author, What is there in the Communion of the Church of

* Page 1.

† P. 5.

England, should make you think your Soul in any Danger? Would there be any Hazard of your Soul, if there were no Invocation of Saints that are dead, in the Offices of the Church: No Pictures or Images of God to be seen there: No Elevation of the Host, which was but of late Years brought into the Church: No Prayers for Souls out of Purgatory: If the Publick Prayers were in the Vulgar Tongue: And if the Sacrament were given in both Kinds, &c. It is certain, these are things which God has not required at our Hands, all but the Two last. The rest he has nowhere enjoined, yet you practise them; these he has taught and expressly commanded, and you forbear, and forbid them. And our Worship therefore is not the worse, for not concurring with yours, in these Corruptions, nor our Souls any way endangered by it. So long as we are sound in the Faith, and our Offices right in other Respects, our Service cannot possibly be the less available to Salvation, for being free from groundless Additions. This is so evident to every one, who is but tolerably acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, that it was artfully done of you, to take no notice that any such Case had ever been put, and to call the next the *first Paragraph*, as if none other had gone before it.

II. *Rest.* Well, but what say you, Sir, to what I call the first Paragraph? Can any thing be more shamefully unjust? What Roman Catholick ever denied Jerusalem to be the Mother Church in the Sense this Author speaks of?

Wind. But why do you Roman Catholicks, as you stile your selves; why, I say, do you call yours the Mother Church, as if all others had sprung from it, when as you know, and do here confess, that not Rome, but Jerusalem was the first Seat of Christianity, where the Gospel began to be published, and from whence its Sound went out, not to Rome only,

only, but into all Lands, and its glad Tidings unto the Ends of the Earth, and was for this reason antiently owned to be * *the Mother of all Churches.*

Rest. This we all grant ; but what I blame this Author for, is, *fixing an Opinion upon us*, which we do not own ; as if we held the Church of Rome, to be antienter than that of *Jerusalem.*

Vind. I am sure this is the most natural, and proper Signification of *the Mother of all Churches.*

Rest. But we plainly declare our meaning in Pope Pius's Creed, when we say, *Sanctam Catholicam, & Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam omnium Ecclesiarum Matrem & Magistram agnosco*, I own the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church, to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches.

Vind. Pardon me good Sir, if I do not think this so very plain. For here you acknowledge your Roman Church, to be not only the *Mistress*, but the *Mother* too of all Churches. And what need of this Title, if you mean no more by it, than you do by the other of *Mistress* ?

III. *Rest.* But what have you to say against her being the *Mistress* of all other Churches, with an indisputable Supremacy over them all.

Vind. Well, I will proceed to answer this Question, and must tell you here, that this is a vain Pretence, and grounded purely upon Usurpation.

Rest. That is very strange.

Vind. Not so very strange neither. For you yourself grant † that throughout the Holy Scripture, there is no Promise made to the City of Rome, nor the least Intimation of her being Head of the

* Τῆς δὲ καὶ μητρὸς ἀπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὺμοις. Theod. H. E. l. 5. c. 9.

† Page 7.

Churches, or the Standard or Center of Unity to 'em all.

Rest. I do so. But then at the same time I expressly tell you, that *the Promises were made to St. Peter, and in him to his Successors*; and hence it is, the Bishops of Rome, his Successors, now claim to be supreme over all the Church, not as seated at Rome, but as Successors to this Universal Pastor.

Vind. I cannot suppose you ignorant, that not an Universal Supremacy, but a Primacy of Order only, was given to the See of Rome, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνῃ, as the Council of Chalcedon speaks, * because of Rome's being † *the imperial City*; and that τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα equal Privileges were at the same time decreed || τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης, τῷ ἁγιοτάτῳ θρόνῳ, to the most Holy Throne of Constantinople, as of a NEW ROME *. Whence you must confess, Rome was not then looked upon to have

* Can. 28.

† *And hereto agrees that of Irenæus, l. 3. c. 3. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentio rem Principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam.*

|| Ibid.

* On which Canon, and the 3d of Constantinople, you may observe what Construction is made by Nilus of Thessalonica, οὗ τῆς παπᾶς ἀρχῆς. p. 8. Τί διὰ τῶν μανδαλινῶν; &c. What else do we learn from hence, but that the Pope had his Primacy above other Churches given him, not by the Apostles, but by the Fathers. And that it was because Rome was the Imperial City. For so says the Canon, ὅτι τῶν πατέρων δέδοται τῷ παπᾷ τὰ πρεσβεῖα, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνῃ, The Privileges were given the Pope by the Fathers, because this was the Chief and Imperial City. And if it had the Preheminence upon this Account, then not because of its Bishop being St. Peter's Successor; and moreover, if it was only from the Fathers [assembled in Council] then not from the Apostles. See also Barlaam to the same purpose. c. 5. p. 26. and Sozomen H. E. l. 7. c. 9.

such an exalted Supremacy, as she now pretends to ; and again, that what she had was not by any Divine Right, but by the Decrees of Councils, and the singular Regard that was paid to her as the Seat of the Emperor. You know also your own Pope Gregory the Great, in an Epistle to the Emperor *Mauritius*, notes it as a Mark of Antichristian Pride, for any one to pretend to the Title of Universal Bishop. His Words are these ;

** I boldly affirm, that whosoever calls himself Universal Bishop, or desires to be so called by others, shews himself by such his Haughtiness, to be a Fore-runner of Antichrist, in as much as he proudly advances himself above all others.*

Rest. I cannot deny, but he speaks also to the same purpose, in divers other Places.

Vind. Be pleased therefore to remember it.

Rest. But we have † plain Proof of St. Peter's Supremacy, and by consequence of his Successors the Bishops of Rome in their several Generations.

Vind. May I know your Proof, first of St. Peter's Supremacy, and afterwards of the Pope's.

** Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se universalem Sacerdotem vocat, aut vocari desiderat, in Elatione suâ Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit. L. 6. Ep. 194. Vide etiam l. 4. ep. 76, 78, 80, 82.*

† C. R. p. 8. You put St. Jerom, St. Cyprian, and St. Chrysostom in your Margin, in hope the unwary Reader will conclude them to bear Testimony to St. Peter's Supremacy. But give me leave to tell you, that he who can find any such thing in any of the Places referred to, must have better Eyes than I have. For I cannot possibly see it there. The first and last have not one Line on this Subject, and you might as well have referred to St. Ignatius's Epistles, or Hermas's Pastor. And the other declares our Saviour would found his Church upon one, as I shall hereafter shew he did ; yet at the same time he affirms, that our Lord gave all his Apostles equal Power and Authority, and so no one of them could claim a Superiority over the others.

Rest.

Rest. Our Proof of St. Peter's Supremacy is two-fold, from Scripture and Universal Tradition.

Vind. That your Tradition is not so universal as you imagine, is pretty evident, from what I have just now observed to you, and will be more so before we part. But pray let me hear, what Authority you have for it from Scripture.

Rest. You shall. Only give me leave by the way, to put you in mind, that this is more than I am any way obliged to. For tell me I pray,
 * *Must nothing be believed but what is in Scripture? Does the Scripture mention every Place, where every Apostle preached the Gospel, or of which they were Bishops?*

Vind. Who says it does? But its Silence in this Respect will never prove, that it might not justly be expected, to speak of so weighty a Point as the Universal Supremacy, of the chief Pastor of all the Churches, if there had been any such. This is a matter of that vast consequence to the whole Body of Christians, that it cannot be imagined, the sacred Writers would all have passed it over in Silence: If St. Peter, and the Popes after him, were to have had the sole Power of governing the whole Church, and of determining all Controversies in Matters of Religion, to tell this to the World, and enjoin all Christians in whatever Parts, to address to them for their Decisions, had been so expeditious a way for preventing, or at least putting a speedy End to, the many Differences that have from time to time infested the Church, then it cannot be thought Almighty God would not have prescribed it, in very plain and legible Characters, that every one might see it. And if all Churches were necessarily to own the

Church of Rome for their Head, and could hope for no Salvation without it ; no doubt those same Scriptures which enjoin the other Parts of our Duty, would not have failed to inform us of this likewise, least otherwise we should run blindly into Perdition.

Rest. This needs some Consideration.

Vind. And yet I have something farther to urge in behalf of the Scriptures, which I am apt to think you have not duly attended to.

Rest. Pray what is that ?

Vind. Do not you teach that St. Peter's Supremacy is founded on Scripture.

Rest. Yes certainly.

Vind. How comes it to pass then, that the Scripture's Silence in this Case is judged so little to the purpose ? Your Claim is from Scripture, and yet you make it not necessary for the Scripture to say any thing of it. This is saying and unsaying with a Witness. And a Man that writes at this rate may set up for an Advocate, for whatever Cause, but will be sure to do right to none.

Rest. I did not think of this. But yet after all, if nothing but Scripture will serve you, you shall have it presently. But here comes a Passage in my way, which I must first beg leave to take some notice of. * *Pray Sir, what does your Author mean by such an Universal Supremacy, as some Popes have claimed ? Some Popes have claimed a Temporal, as well as a Spiritual Supremacy. Your Author should know, this is no Part of our Faith. Popes are Men, and have their Failings, as others have --- That the Passages he quotes, cannot be strained to the Pope's Temporal Supremacy, and that they were not so understood, in the Primitive Church, I will not deny.*

* C. R. p. 10.

Vind. To omit Numbers of extravagant Sayings to this purpose in the Canonists. I presume you will not deny likewise, that † *Bellarmin*, and * others of your Principal Writers do assert, and earnestly ∴ contend for such a Power in the Pope, at least indirectly, and *in ordine ad spiritualia*. And if he exercises it, as he has often || done; it matters not much to those who feel the effects of it, what the Pretence for it be. Your own most Learned and Judicious *Du Pin* proclaims it, as a matter out of doubt, that not only the rest of the Empire, and

† De Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 6. & in Barclaium c. 16.

* Pontificem esse caput totius Ecclesiæ, & habere potestatem etiam circa omnia temporalia, probamus ex Theologis & Canonistis. *Boz. de Eccl. Monarch. temp.* Epist. Dedicat. ad *Clem. VIII. Pontif.* Qui est Deus in terris, Deus universi, Regum Pater. *Martin. V.* in Conc. *Sienn.* In Ecclesiâ Christianâ potestas temporalis subjecta & subordinata est potestati spirituali: Ergo Princeps spiritualis potest imperare Principi temporali, & disponere de rebus temporalibus in ordine ad bonum spirituale. *Becan. de Jure & Just. c. III. Quæst. VII.* Negant Hæretici ---- Pontificem posse ullo modo imperare Principibus sæcularibus, neque regnis; & principatu posse eos privare, etsi illi privari alioqui mereantur. *Id.* Quæst. VIII. Certè qui in potestate Petri temporalem gladium esse negat, malè verbum attendit Domini proferentis, converte gladium tuum in vaginam, uterque ergo est in potestate Ecclesiæ, spiritualis scilicet gladius & materialis. *Bonif. Octav.* in extravagante *unam sanctam*.

∴ As is to be seen at large in *Chamier de Temporalis Papæ Potestate*. See also *C. Perron. Repl. à la Réponse du Roy &c. p. 73.* & *Harangue au tiers état. p. 600, &c. & 621.* *Richer. Hist. Conc. General. l. 1. c. 8. n. 13.* *De Serres Invent. de l'hist. de France, l'ann. 1613.*

|| *Platin.* in vit. *Greg. 7.* & *Bin. Conc. to. 7. p. 484.* *Plat.* in vit. *Honor. 3.* *Greg. 9.* & *Innoc. 4.* Bull. *Sixti. V.* contra *Hen. Navarr. Sand. de schism. Angl. l. 1. p. 131. & l. 3. p. 368.* *Cherub. Bullar. p. 704. &c.* *Cambd. vit. Eliz. Regin. part. 2. A.D. 1570.* *Du Pin. de Antiq. Eccl. Disciplinâ Dissert. 4. p. 333.*

more

more particularly of *Italy*, but even || *Rome* it self was under the Civil Government of *Constantine* and his Successors, and not of the Pope. But as absurd and unreasonable as this Claim is, you say you can maintain it from Scripture.

Rest. Yes, very easily. Did you never read those Words in the New Testament. * *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it :* And those others, † *Feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep ?*

Vind. I know those Words very well ; but I hoped you would have given some Evidence from Scripture, of this Supremacy you are contending for. And do you now think to put me off with these Passages, which prove nothing like it ?

Rest. Pray Sir think again. Do you not see it plainly proved here ?

Vind. By no means. Our Saviour says, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* But you very well remember, our Author has ∴ already observ'd to you, || *St. Augustin*, * *Gregory Nazianzen*, † *St. Cyril*, || *St. Chrysostom*, * *St. Ambrose*, and † *Hilary of Poitiers*, profess the Rock here spoken

|| Il est constant que la ville de Rome, l'Italie, & toutes les autres Provinces de l'Empire de l'occident, ont été, sous la puissance de *Constantine* & des Empereurs qui lui ont succédé. L'Histoire nous apprend, qu'ils en étoient les Maîtres absolus, qu'ils y envoient des Gouverneurs, que la ville de Rome dependoit de leur Loix, de leur pouvoir, & des Magistrats qu'ils y vouloient établir, qu'ils y faisoient tel changement que bon leur sembloit ; en un mot, qu'ils n'en étoient pas moins les Maîtres que de toutes les autres villes du monde. *Nouv. Biblioth. To. 2. p. 21. edit. in 4to.*

* *St. Matthew 16. 18.*

† *St. John 21. 15, 16, 17.*

∴ *Case Stated p. 5.*

|| *De verbis Domini Serm. 12.*

* *De Vet. Test.*

† *De Trin. l. 4.*

|| *Hom. 55. in Matth.*

* *In Ephes. 2.*

† *De Trin. l. 2. c. 6.*

of was not *Peter*, but that Faith which *Peter* here confessed, and has told you † there are many more. And do you dispute the Truth of this?

Rest. You do not find me questioning it. But yet I hope I have at least ballanc'd these, by an Addition of other Fathers that speak otherwise.

Vind. This if true may shew the Fathers to be divided in their Judgment, about the Sense of this Text. But that they are so, is a very odd Medium for proving them all of your side, and manifestly proves the contrary. But now if even these few you cite should be against you, what becomes then of your Supremacy?

Rest. I have taken care to pick out such Authorities, as cannot fail me. Never fear that.

Vind. The first is in an Epistle of *St. Cyprian* to * *Florentius Pupianus*; where *Rigaltius* an eminent Commentator, and one of your own Communion, † interprets *St. Cyprian's* Words concerning this Promise of our blessed Saviour, in like manner as our Author does. The next is in *St. Basil* upon the Second Chapter of *Isaiab*, where speaking of the Church of the living God, he says, || ἡς οἱ θεμελίαι εἰσὶν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῖς ἁγίοις, &c. whose Foundations are upon the Holy Mountains. For it is built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. One of these Mountains was *Peter*, upon which Rock our Lord promised to build his Church. Where *St. Basil* teaches *Peter* to be one of the Mountains, on which the Church was to be built; though but one, for it was to be built not only upon *St. Peter*, but upon the rest of the Apostles with him. And what you will get by this, I cannot understand. You hint also at some Place, in one of his Treatises against

† Amongst others *Just. M. c. Tryph. p. 327. Theod. Ep. 77. & Theophyl. in loc.*

* Ep. 66.

† Annot. Oxon. in loc.

|| To. 2. p. 70.

Eunomius, but not being pleased to tell which of them, you make me suspect there is nothing to the purpose there. And I hope you will excuse me, if I do not turn over all five of them, in pursuit of what I so little expect to find by it. After *St. Basil* you appeal to *St. Chrysostom de Petro & Paulo*; but for what Reason I cannot conceive, unless purely to adorn your Margin with so great a Name. For in the first place, you cannot but know, that it is questioned by Learned Men, whether this Oration be *St. Chrysostom's*. But not to insist upon that, though an unanswerable Objection, here is nothing at all that answers your Design. The Author, whosoever he was, magnifies and applauds these Two great Apostles, but says not a Word, that I can find, of the Text now under Consideration. And in his Praises of the Apostles, if he give the Preference to either above the other, it seems to be to *St. Paul*. I grant he puts the Question, || τί γὰρ Πέτρος μείζων; *Tell me what is greater than St. Peter?* But this will not answer your Intent, for the next Words following are, τί δὲ Παύλος ἴσον; *but what is equal to Paul?* Which is so far from establishing *St. Peter's* Supremacy, or proving him to be the Rock, on which our Saviour was to build his Church, that it gives *St. Paul* as good, if not a better Title to it. *St. Jerom** speaks more in your favour, yet does not so particularly appropriate the Blessing he promised, as to make it belong to *St. Peter* alone. For thus he expresses himself. *As our Saviour gave to the Apostles, that they might be called the Light of the World, and they received other Appellations from him; so also to Simon, who believed in Christ the Rock, he gave the Name of Peter. And according to the Metaphor of a Rock, it is*

|| To. 5. p. 992. Edit. Savil.

* In loc.

rightly said to him, I will build my Church upon Thee. Here the Words you referred to, denote St. Peter, not his Faith or Profession, to be the Rock on which the Church was to be built. But withal you see, that it was only in common with his Fellow Apostles, to whom our Lord gave the Privilege of being Lights to the World, whereby to conduct them to his Church and Religion. The next is St. *Augustin* who says, * *The Lord named Peter the Foundation of the Church, and therefore the Church worthily honours this Foundation, upon which the Height of the Ecclesiastical Building is raised.* And here you think you have me very sure.

Rest. And what can you say for your self?

Vind. I can say, the best way to understand St. *Augustin's* Meaning, is by letting him be his own Interpreter, who certainly best understood his own Sense. And this I think he gives us very clearly in his Exposition of St. *John's* Gospel, in these Words, † *For the Lord says, upon this Rock I will build my Church, because Peter had said, thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Therefore upon this Rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. For the Rock was Christ, upon which Foundation even Peter himself was built.* Nay upon the very next Sermon to that here referred to || are these Words, *He is called a Rock, because he first laid the Foundations of Faith to the Nations, and like an immoveable Stone supported the Frame and Mass of the whole Christian Building. He is therefore termed a Rock, upon the account of his Devotion, and the Lord is called a Rock upon the account of his Power, as says the Apostle: They drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed*

* Serm. 15. de sanctis.

† Tract. 124. de Cap. 21. To. 9. p. 389.

|| Serm. 2. in eodem festo. To. 10. p. 852.

them, and that Rock was Christ. *He rightly obtains a Partnership in the Name, who bears his Part in the Work. For in the same House Peter lays the Foundation, Peter plants, the Lord waters, and gives the Increase.* Thus far I think your Authorities signify so little, that what you get by them you may put in your Eye, and see never the worse. But there is one other yet remaining, which comes therefore to be considered in the last place, and that is of St. Cyril of Alexandria, || in his second Book, you tell us upon St. John and the Twelfth Chapter. Whereto it might suffice to answer, you ought to have known that there being but Nine Chapters in that Book, you will not be able to find any thing to your purpose in a Twelfth. But I am willing to try, if I can help you out of the strait you have brought your self into by taking this Reference upon Trust. And I therefore own that in the first Chapter of the first Book, is what I persuade my self you would have rejoiced at, had you been aware of its being there. The Substance of it is, that our Saviour would no longer have the Apostle we are concerned about, go by the Name of *Simon*, but gave him that of *Peter*, because of it's Affinity to Πέτρα a Rock. This might have been of some Service to you, but that St. Cyril upon another occasion, takes these Words of our Lord in the other Sense. For there he declares * this Name to signify *nothing else but the immoveable steady Faith of the Disciple, on which the Church of Christ is settled and established beyond Danger of falling, and remains continually in defiance to all the shocks of the Gates of Hell.* Be pleased to take this along with you, and then you are at free Liberty to make what use you can of this Father.

|| L. 2. in John c. 12.

* De S. Trin. Dial. 4.

Rest. I see you will have something to object to the fullest Evidence I can bring against you.

Vind. That is only because it is not full enough. Of all the Authors you have cited, not so much as one is throughly of your Opinion. And of this you was so sensible before-hand, that you knew not how positively to deny it, and therefore declare your self to † own some of them, look upon this Passage of St. Matthew, as having two Senses, and sometimes they take it in one Sense, and sometimes in the other.

Rest. But ∴ I defy your Author, and all his Party together, to shew any Passage of any Father, that excludes St. Peter.

Vind. Notably spoken and like a brave Hero! However I accept the Challenge. And since you grant any Passage of any Father will suffice, what say you to this in *Palladius*. * Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρᾳ, τῆς τ' ὅτι τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ, οἰκοδομήσω μὲν ἡ ἐκκλησίαν, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock, that is to say, this Confession I will build my Church? It is very full and express.

Rest. It seems so at first View.

Vind. And certainly is so. However take another. It is of St. Cyril of *Alexandria*; and you may answer it when you can. || He gave the Name of the Rock to nothing else, but the unshaken and most constant Faith of the Disciple, on which the Church of Christ is so settled and established, as never to fall, but to bear up against the Gates of Hell, and so to remain for ever. This I hope is as exclusive of St. Peter, as you can expect or desire. For if nothing else was called the Rock, but the Faith of the Disciple, then in this Father's Opinion St. Peter himself was not

† C. R. p. 11.

∴ Ibid.

* Devit. Chrysost. c. 19.

|| Dial. de Trin. l. 4.

the Rock. And yet I will take the Liberty to add a Testimony or two more, which happen to come in my way ; that so out of the Mouth of three or four Witnesses, you may be fully convinced. In a Saxon Homily quoted by † Bede is this Passage. *I build my Church upon this Rock, that is upon the Belief that thou confessest. The whole Church of God is founded upon this Rock, that is upon Christ. For he is the Foundation of all the Building of his Church.* If you can find that this Profession is not exclusive of St. Peter, you will make a great and unexpected Discovery. And yet this is not all. I have already given you some account of St. Augustin's Judgment in the Case ; but I have now another Testimony from him that requires your Consideration. And it is this. * *It is said by the Lord, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, namely the Rock which Peter has confessed, saying, thou art Christ the Son of the living God. As if Peter, who had his Name from this Rock, || was to represent the Church built upon this Rock, and has received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. For it is not said, thou art the Rock, but thou art † Peter. But the Rock was Christ, whom Simon having confessed, as the whole Church confesses him, he is called Peter.* You cannot deny Peter to be undoubtedly excluded here from being the Rock, *It is not said to him, says the Father, Thou art the Rock ; and if this be not a sufficient Exclusion of him, I know not what will or can satisfy you.*

Rest. I did not conceive you could have said so much for your self.

Vind. This is not the first time you have been mistaken. And to shew that you are so in another

† Serm. Cath. Kal. Jul. Pass. Apost. Pet. & Paul. p. 237.

* Retract. l. 1. c. 21.

|| Petra.

† Petrus.

respect too, with Relation to the Text we have been so long upon, if it will oblige you much, I will now quit our Author for a while, and suppose with you *St. Peter* himself, and not the Faith he professed, to be the Rock spoken of by our Saviour, and then will leave it to you, to make the best you can of this Supposition. For all you can infer from hence, is only that the Church should in some Sense be built upon *St. Peter*; as it was to be also upon the rest of the Apostles. For so says *St. Paul*, *Ephes. ii. 20. And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.* Whence it appears, that the other Apostles were Foundation-stones in this Ecclesiastical Building, and not *St. Peter* alone, tho' I deny not but he was more remarkably so, than the rest of them. For it may easily be granted, that a peculiar Privilege was designed him in these Words, and that by him, after our Blessed Saviour, the Foundation of the Church should be first laid, for the other Apostles to build upon, amongst both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And if this were what our Lord intended, it was accordingly verified, as we read in the *Acts* of the Holy Apostles. For no sooner had this Apostle preached to the *Jews*, and converted Three Thousands of them, *Ch. ii. 41.* which were added to the Hundred and Twenty Disciples, but presently we are told, *Verse 47. that the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.* So that here was now a Church, and this Church in an especial manner built upon *St. Peter*, according to our Saviour's Promise. But then he was farther to lay the Foundation of the *Gentile* Church too, as well as the *Jewish*. And accordingly when *Cornelius* a Roman Centurion was to be admitted into the Number of Christians, *St. Peter* was sent upon this Errand, *Ch. x. 19, &c.* And when he

B a

had

had preached the Gospel at *Cæsarea*, and the Spirit had come upon them that heard him, to the Astonishment of *those of the Circumcision*, who now saw, that on the Gentiles also was poured out the Gift of the Holy Ghost, verse 45. he commanded them to be baptized in the Name of the Lord, verse 48. And afterwards in the Council at *Jerusalem*, *Acts xv. 7.* He made his Appeal concerning this Truth, to all there assembled, *Ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the words of the Gospel, and believe.* So that here was a perfect Completion of our Saviour's Promise to *St. Peter*, so far as it contained any Prerogative peculiar to himself. And I am well assured, with all the Assistance you can get, you will never be able to make more of it.

*Rest. * I deny that these Words are not a sufficient Proof for the Spiritual Supremacy, which all Popes have claimed, or that they were not so understood in the Primitive Church.*

Vind. I know you do; but I am not bound to acquiesce in your Determination. It is not your Denial we want, but the Reason of it, and that you will be so kind as to shew us our Error if we be in one, by some good Evidence of it for our Conviction. I have particularly observed, that you have given no Proof, that the Rock spoken of was *St. Peter*, and not rather his frank Confession of our Saviour; and that you have not disproved, what our Author had hinted concerning the Judgment of the Fathers in this behalf. I have moreover produced divers other Citations, to make this Truth the more apparent. And after this have nevertheless taken the Words in your Sense, and shewn that when so interpreted,

* C. R. p. 10.

they were remarkably fulfilled in *St. Peter's* laying the first Foundation of the Church, amongst both *Jews* and *Gentiles*. And by consequence, if you have no better Arguments for your pretended universal Supremacy, than what this Text affords, it is time to give over your Claim to it.

Rest. But what say you to the Commission given to *St. Peter*, to feed our Saviour's *Sheep* and *Lambs*? Let me tell you, * *This Text is more express to prove St. Peter's Primacy, than any your Author has mentioned for St. Paul.*

Vind. What our Author has mentioned for *St. Paul*, shall be considered in its proper Place. At present you may please to take notice, that if these Words be of any Use to prove a Supremacy in *St. Peter*, they will certainly overthrow such an one as you contend for, by proving too much, and so will be of no Advantage to you.

Rest. If they be of any Use to prove it! Why do you question that?

Vind. I not only question, but deny it, and have a great deal of Reason for so doing. Nor would any one, not mightily under the Power of Prejudice, ever attempt to raise so weighty a Superstructure upon so feeble and sandy a Foundation as this is. It was the necessary Duty of all the Apostles, during their Time, and of their Successors in all following Generations, to feed our Saviour's *Lambs* and *Sheep*. And what tho' *St. Peter* was required to do the same, this implies no more Jurisdiction in him, than in the other Apostles, on each of whom this Duty was no less incumbent than on him. It is true, our Saviour gave him a particular Charge to be careful in this respect, and repeated it a second, and a third time

to make him the more sensible of it. But then you are to know, that if the Words themselves do not convey any such paramount Jurisdiction, the Repetition of them can never do it. This seems to have been rather by way of Reprehension to the Apostle, for his notorious Sin of thrice openly denying his Master, when he had but just before made Profession of an immoveable Fidelity to him. Which gave just reason to our Saviour, to be more than ordinarily strict in his Injunctions to this Apostle, whereby to make him the more careful and diligent for the future. And this is all the Cause I can see, for our Saviour's thus commanding him to be particularly mindful of his Flock, to look watchfully after them, and give them their Meat in due Season. And in this Opinion I am the more confirmed, because, as I said, if any Supremacy were conveyed by these Words, they would prove too much ; and so we should have a greater Number of Supremes than you are aware of.

Rest. I do not see that.

Vind. Perhaps so ; but I shall prove it to you.

Rest. That is impossible.

Vind. Pray cast your Eye upon these Words of St. Paul, * *Take heed unto your selves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own Blood.* This Charge St. Paul does not give to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus, barely upon his own Apostolical Authority, but expressly declares them to have been constituted by the Holy Ghost, Overseers over the Flock of God, his Church, and that it was therefore their indispensable Duty to feed it. So that if a Divine Commission for the Performance of this important Duty, entails an

* *Acts xx. 28.*

Universal Supremacy upon the Person that has it, here were at once as many invested with this high Authority, as there were *Ephesian* Elders at that time. For all these the Apostle declares to have been endowed by the Holy Ghost with sufficient Power to *feed* the Flock of Christ. Wherefore you must either grant the Church, at least at that time, to have had so many supreme Heads, which I fully perswade my self you will not, or must yield that a Commission to *feed* these *Sheep*, is not a sufficient Foundation, whereupon to erect an Universal Supremacy for any one.

Rest. This I had not thought of, and I beg leave to consider it.

Vind. In the mean time let me add a farther Remark, for clearing of this Point we have been so long upon, of *St. Peter's* Universal Supremacy, which is this, that *St. Peter* never pretended all his Life time, to any such singular Privilege; and yet one would think he should have understood the Nature, and Extent of his own Authority, as well as you, or any of your Church can do at this great distance. To evince this, I desire it may be remembred, that he had so many Occasions for exerting this Power, had he believed himself to have it, that he could not well have failed, of leaving divers Instances of it upon Record; and yet the most diligent Enquirer amongst us can discover no one Memorandum of it. When a new Apostle was to be chosen, there was no Application made to *St. Peter*, either to tell them whom he would nominate to that Office, or to issue out his Warrant for an Election. In the Council assembled at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* xv. there is no Intimation of *St. Peter's* presiding there, but *St. James* appears rather to have had the Preheminence, as Bishop of that See. And it is certain, He, not *St. Peter*, pronounced the Decree.

So likewise *when the Apostles at Jerusalem had heard, that Samaria had received the Word of God, Acts viii. 14.* Observe what follows hereupon. St. Peter did not order some of the other Apostles, to go, and instruct, and baptize them; but on the contrary, the Text tells us plainly, *the Apostles sent to them Peter and John.* Again, when the Divisions were so rife in the Church of *Corinth*, * one being for *Paul*, and another for *Apollos*, &c. St. Peter was not sent to for the Decision of these Controversies; nor did he ever take upon him to determine them, or to punish those who were in the wrong, as doubtless he would have done, had it been his Province: Nor is it to be thought, he would so patiently have born with St. *Paul's* *withstanding him to his Face*, as we find he did †, had he known himself his Sovereign; nor on the other hand, would St. *Paul* have allowed himself to do it, had he known the other to be his lawful Superior, and the only chief Governor over all the Apostles.

Rest. You run so fast, you seem to have forgotten, that I have already given a full Answer to these Instances you are pressing again upon me, as if nothing had been said to them.

Vind. They are so full against any Claim of a Supremacy in St. Peter, that I could not omit them; and how satisfactorily you have answered any of them, I come next to shew. I begin therefore with St. Peter's being sent to *Samaria*. Of this says our Author, || *It had little become the Apostles, to send their Sovereign upon Business, as they sent Peter to Samaria, if they had owned him for such.* Whereto you reply by way of Query, whether

* 1 Cor. i. 1, 2.

† Gal. ii. 11.

|| C. S. p. 6.

he thinks * *all sending denotes Superiority in the Senders, and Subjection in the Sent ?*

Rest. And what have you to say to this ?

Vind. That instead of answering his Argument you have chosen purely to evade it ; and the better to do this, have started a new Question. You ask, whether *all sending denotes Superiority in the Senders*, but do not say whether it would be thought indecent, for Subjects to take upon them to send their Sovereign ; which was our Author's Argument : However in answer to your Query, I grant that to send another, does not necessarily and always, tho' ordinarily it does, denote an Inferiority in the Person sent. Nor need it ; for to overthrow your Plea, it is enough that it denote an Equality. And this sufficiently answers your Question, and the two first Instances you bring for its Confirmation. And the third I believe, upon second Thoughts you will not be backward to retract. At least till you find out some Privy Council, that has really attempted to send their Sovereign to the War. They may advise, and humbly and dutifully encourage him to it, where they see Reason for it, without exceeding their proper Province ; but sending him is an Act of a very different nature. And perhaps you are the first, that ever ventured to confound them. I am sure I must believe so, till you can produce some Evidence to the contrary.

Rest. Another thing your Author urges with good Assurance, is St. Paul's withstanding † St. Peter to his face. This, says he, || *seems a Behaviour not very suitable to the supreme Head of the Church, both Jews and Gentiles, if St. Paul had known any thing of St. Peter's being so constituted by Christ.*

* C. R. p. 16.

† Gal. ii. 11.

|| C. S. p. 6.

Vind. And his Remark is very just, being no more than what St. Cyprian had taught long before, in one of his Epistles; where upon occasion of the Contention between these two great Apostles, he affirms, * *Nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, &c.* Neither did Peter whom the Lord chose first, and † on whom he built his Church, insolently claim, or arrogantly assume any thing to himself, when Paul disputed with him, about Circumcision, as if he had a Superiority over the rest, and that he ought rather to be obeyed by the recentest and last Apostles. Here you see, this zealous Father speaks of the Superiority you are so earnest for, as what it would have been Insolence and Arrogance in St. Peter to have pretended to, even over St. Paul and others the very last of the Apostles. Whereto also agrees that of Hilary the Deacon in his Commentary upon these Words of St. Paul. || *Who of them durst resist Peter the first Apostle, to whom the Lord gave the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; but such another, who well knowing himself invested with an Equality of Power, might constantly bear his Testimony, against what this Apostle had unadvisedly done?* This is the same Doctrine our Author teaches; and it was good Catholick Doctrine in those early Times of Christianity. But now it seems, it will not go down with you, and those of your Party. I am inclinable to think, such an open Opposition would not be allowed of as a suitable Carriage, towards your Sovereign Lord the Pope. And yet the great Apostle of the

* Ep. 71. Quinto Fratri.

† Vid. Annot. Oxon. in loc.

|| Quis eorum auderet Petro primo Apostolo, cui claves regni cœlorum Dominus dedit, resistere: nisi alius talis, qui fiducia Electionis suæ sciens se non imparem, constanter improbaret, quod ille sine consilio fecerat. *Hil. Diac. in Gal ii. 11.* Inter Opera S. Ambrosii. To. 3.

Gentiles was not ashamed to own, that he had used it towards *St. Peter*, under whom your Popes make their Claim.

Rest. No matter for that. I have given you Instances of *Jethro's* withstanding *Moses*.

Vind. As much as to say he withstood, or rebuked his Son in Law, who kept his Cattel for him. *Exod.* ii. 21. and iii. 1. A wonderful Argument for evincing the Dutifulness of a Subject's treating the Head of the Universal Church in a like manner, had it been true ! But I must beg a little farther Information, before I can admit of it as such. For as you are not pleased to tell us, whence you had your notice, of this Contest between *Moses* and his Father in Law ; so I must own my Ignorance of it, and do therefore conceive, you have fallen into a small Mistake, using the Name of *Jethro*, instead of those Egyptian Magicians, *Jannes* and *Jambres*, of whom *St. Paul* tells us, * that they withstood *Moses*. And I hope you will not recommend such notorious Heathen Impostors, as a Pattern for the Imitation of Christian Subjects towards their Superiors.

Rest. No I did not design that. But I tell you farther that *Joab* withstood *David*.

Vind. And I must take the Liberty to tell you, that † *Menochius*, and other Commentators blame him for it, as not respectful enough to his Sovereign. And I cannot doubt, but you would have been ready your self, at another time, to disapprove of such a Behaviour in any Subject, towards his King, and more especially towards so great an Apostle, such an universal Governor, as you suppose *St. Peter* to have been, howsoever at present, to serve a Cause, you are willing to excuse it.

* 2 Tim. iii. 8.

† In 2 Sam. xix. 6.

Rest. I say farther St. *John* Baptist withstood *Herod* ; and what Objection have you against this? Will you say either that I am mistaken, or that he was to blame for it?

Vind. I say neither. St. *John* was a Prophet, and more, says our * Saviour, *than a Prophet*, and if as such, he reprov'd a wicked King for his Vices, when they became scandalously flagitious and abominable, you will hardly say he herein exceeded his Commission. But sure you will not pretend to parallel St. *Peter* to *Herod*, or affirm that he was equally to be withstood. Especially had he been as much above all Kings, and other Potentates, as those of your Way would have him thought to have been.

Rest. I add moreover, that † *Porphyry* blamed St. *Paul*, for withstanding St. *Peter*, looking upon it as unpardonable *Sawciness*, thus to oppose his Superior ; and infer from hence, that || St. *Peter's* Supremacy was so notoriously known, that the Heathens themselves were convinced, it was the common Belief of the Christians.

Vind. So that it seems for want of Christian Evidence, you are come now to the Testimony of a malicious Heathen Enemy to Christianity, a Villain as you think fit to characterize him, and by consequence a notable Prop for the Support of your sinking Cause. You are not pleased to acquaint us, whence you had this Testimony. Nor am I much concerned about it. I doubt not but it comes originally from St. *Jerom's* Preface, to his Comment on the Epistle to the *Galatians*, where he reckons this as one of the Objections that had been rais'd against the Apostles and their Doctrine, and more particularly against this Epistle

* St. *Mat.* xi. 9.

† C. R. p. 15.

|| Ibid.

of *St. Paul*. In which place it is yet observable, that this foul-mouthed Railer, tho' desirous to muster up all the Objections he could against Christianity, as Renegades are wont to do, against the Persons and Doctrines they have left, speaks not a Word of *St. Peter's* Supremacy; but * sought rather to accuse him of Misbehaviour or Error; Of which you have no reason to be proud. And yet if he had spoken of it, this would never have answered your Design of shewing that *St. Peter's* Supremacy was notoriously known amongst the Heathens. Inasmuch as had it been true, it might have been known to *Porphyry*, tho' to few others of the Heathens, because being an Apostate from Christianity, as not only || *Nicephorus* testifies, but * *St. Augustin* too, † *Socrates*, he might have been acquainted with it whilst a Christian, and not have learned it from the Heathens. Thus grossly are you out, not only in your Testimony, but likewise in your Inference from it; which I hope is abundantly enough to set them both aside.

Rest. What have you to offer against my following Arguments?

Vind. You argue from a charitable Advice, to a Parent, and a Right of fairly and dutifully representing a Prince's Crimes to him, for a Liberty to withstand our highest Superiors, and even the principal Governor and Head of the whole Church. Which you must own not to be a right method of Procedure. For there is a vast Difference between humbly petitioning, or even dutifully remonstrating to a Superior, to whom we think our

* Volens illi maculam inurere.

|| *E. H. l. 10. c. 36.*

* *De civ. Dei. l. 10. c. 28.*

† *Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 23.*

selves obliged submissively to represent his Mistakes or Faults, and boldly withstanding and reproving him for them. And it is not fair, from the Usage of the one, to infer the Lawfulness and Decency of the other. What you say of a Priest's standing up, and bearing Testimony against his heretical Bishop, is more to your purpose, but does not come up to it. For every Priest is bound, as he shall have Ability and Occasion, *to contend earnestly for the Faith* ; but withal if it be against his Bishop, or other lawful Superior, he must do it in a much more respectful manner, than *St. Paul* seems to have used towards this Apostle. So that upon the whole, you have no way invalidated our Author's Argument from *St. Paul's* withstanding *St. Peter* to the face, in such a manner as he could not have allowed himself to use, had he known him to be the Prince of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ, and Head of his Universal Church.

Rest. I hope you will not charge me with not having duely answered your Author's next Argument, from *St. Paul's* having *the Care of all the Churches upon him*, and giving out Orders for all Churches. This he boasts of, and says, *There is nothing that is said of St. Peter, is so express as what St. Paul says of himself* in this respect. And *this*, I have told him, * *is a bold Affirmation*, and wants Proof to back it.

Vind. But now if I should ask, what Proof you have against him, what could you say for your self?

Rest. I must tell you, as I do him, *it has been answered often, and he takes no notice of it.*

Vind. If it has been so often answered, it will be the more easily answered now.

Rest. My Answer then is this. *By the Care of all the Churches* is meant * of those Churches only which were planted by himself; and it was to these only he ordained what he thought fit.

Vind. And is this your way of Answering? The Apostle positively declares, *the Care of all the Churches came upon him daily*; and you tell him no, it was only of some particular Churches, which he himself had planted. He says, *so ordain I in all the Churches*; and here again you contradict him, and tell him he had nothing to do, to issue forth his Orders for any but those under his more immediate Inspection. As if St. Paul did not understand his own Business, and the Extent of his Power, 'til you came to direct him, and settle it for him. I am well assured our Author was in the right, when he said; *If such a Decretal could be produced of St. Peter's, I doubt not it would have been made use of, towards proving his Universal Supremacy.* And have often thought, if these Words had been spoken by St. Peter, what a Noise we should have had in our Ears with them. But being spoken by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, they are to signify nothing. They consist not well with St. Peter's

* See how this agrees with the Doctrine of Theodoret. 'Εβραίοις ὃ γράφων, ὧν ἐκ ἐνεχειρίδι τ' ἐπιμέλειαν. Præf. in Ep. ad Hebr. ὑπὸ γὰρ τ' ἡμῶν ἄλλων Ἀποστόλων περιμήθειαν ἐτέλεον. Ibid. Again, 'Εβραίοις ἐπιστέλλει, πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη Ἀποστολεῖς. Ibid. To the same effect speaks, Clement of Alexandria, apud Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 14. Οὐκ ἐγγραφείη ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων Ἀπόστολον διὰ τε πρὸς τὸ κύριον πρῶτον, διὰ τε τὸ ἐκ πίστεως καὶ πρὸς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν, ἐδυνάμην κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ Ἀπόστολον. And Oecumenius since, Arg. Epist. ad Hebr. Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος διδάσκαλος ἐδυνάμην γινώσκων καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀποσταλεῖς, κηρύττει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον γράφας τε πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι, γράφει λοιπὸν καὶ τοῖς ἐκ πίστεως πνεύματι Ἑβραίοις.

pretended Supremacy, which must not be meddled with upon whatever Terms, and therefore it is a Vanity to insist upon them. And yet after all they are the Words of Holy Scripture, and to be relied upon, incomparably beyond all your groundless Imaginations and Conceits. And they suit excellently well with the Order given to all the Apostles to go, and *teach*, or rather * make Disciples of *all Nations*, all Parts of the World wherever they should come. To this end, our Blessed Saviour not only † sent them, as his Father had sent him, but || when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. Their Commission you see was General, and of large Extent, not confining any of them to any particular District or Diocese. And no wonder therefore if they had an unlimited Concern for all Christians in whatever Part of the Earth, and gave out their Orders for the Direction of any they had Opportunity of visiting, or sending to, by whomsoever first planted. And if you are resolved to have it otherwise, I must desire to know the Grounds of such your Resolution. Such a Commission as St. Peter had, such had also St. Paul, together with the rest of the Apostles; but that any one of them had any peculiar Diocese, otherwise than by Agreement amongst themselves, you may assert as confidently as you please, but will never be able to make it out. And yet I am not come up to what our Author intended. For he does not say the fore-mentioned Words declare St. Paul to have had any proper Jurisdiction over

* Μαθητεύσατε. St. Matth. xxviii. 19.

† St. John xx. 21.

|| Verse 22, 23.

all Churches, beyond what the other Apostles had; but that had any thing of this Nature been said of St. Peter, *he doubted not but it would have been made use of, towards proving his Universal Supremacy.* And if he had pleased, he might have added, it would have been made more use of to that purpose, than all the whole New Testament besides. And what Answer can you give to this? Do you deny it? By no means. On the contrary you undertake to justify such an Application, would the Case have born it. *May not the same Words, say you, * be used to signify a King's Power, and a Magistrate's? Yet the King's Power implies Independence, and the Magistrate's Subordination.* An apparent Acknowledgment that had these Words been on your side, you would have been sure to make use of them, for the support of your pretended Supremacy. Which is all he charged you with. And yet again, Power and Authority, you say, signify differently when applied to a Sovereign, and when to a Magistrate. About which Distinction I will not dispute with you; but only shall tell you, that to make it applicable to your purpose, you are first to prove St. Peter really had that Supremacy you would enstate him in, and St. Paul was an Inferior Agent under him, before you conclude their Powers to have been thus different. I add, that what I here offer in behalf of St. Paul, St. Chrysostom affirms of Bishops in general, and is therefore more apparently indisputable in behalf of St. Paul, or any other Apostle; that † *every Bishop ought to take care, [as he has opportunity,] not only of his own Church, [or Diocese] but of the whole Church dispersed throughout the World.* This that eminent Father teaches; and you may disprove it if you can, and may

* C. R. p. 12.

† Tom. 5. Orat. 93. p. 631.

try to convince both him, and St. Paul of Falshood.

Rest. * *We own that the Gentiles were St. Paul's peculiar Charge, but with subordination to the Supreme Pastor.*

Vind. What you own, as to St. Paul's being the Apostle of the Gentiles, we own too. But then your supposed Subordination we deny; and I hope I have competently disproved it already, though that was more than I was any way obliged to, the Proof of it lying properly upon you. But if I will wait for that, I find I may wait till Doomsday; for you are rather for supposing than proving it.

Rest. The same Conjecture your Author has, about what is said of St. James in the Synod at Jerusalem, and I make the same Reply I do here, that † *Words may have a different Signification, according to the Persons they are applied to.*

Vind. And my Answer will therefore serve here too, that before you go to affix such a different Signification, you ought clearly and evidently to prove, the Difference between the Persons to whom you apply them.

Rest. I have told my thoughts of the matter several times.

Vind. I presume you do not take upon your self, to have a Power of determining all Controversies. It is your Arguments, not your Thoughts I call for.

Rest. * *The History of the Acts of the Apostles has enough in it, to convince any unprejudiced Person, of St. Peter's Supremacy.*

* C. R. p. 14.

* C. R. p. 18.

† Pag. 19.

Vind. As how ?

Rest. I. It gives him always the first Place.

Vind. This denotes only a Primacy of Order, and Respect, as he was the eldest Apostle, the first that came, and thenceforward stayed constantly with our Lord. Which might very well be, and actually was without any Supremacy over the rest. In like manner as in our House of Lords the Prince of *Wales*, when there is one, takes place of all the rest, but this Precedence gives him no Sovereignty over them.

Rest. II. He proposes first the Election of a new Apostle.

Vind. And what if St. *Thomas*, or St. *Bartholomew* had made that Proposal ? Wou'd this have given either of them a Supremacy over the rest ? You cannot pretend it. And yet if this Observation signify any thing, it must necessarily have done it.

Rest. III. After the Descent of the Holy Ghost, he first Preaches to the Jews.

Vind. This was in pursuance of our Saviour's Promise, of building his Church upon him, if he were really the Rock on which it was to be built, as some have thought. Besides, has our Saviour any where promised, that whosoever Preached first to the People, should have a Supremacy over his whole Church ? If he has, produce the Promise. If he has not, as you know he has not, be ingenuous, and own your Error, in claiming so transcendent a Privilege, without any Promise whereupon to found your Claim.

Rest. IV. He works the first Miracle in confirmation of the Gospel.

Vind. But where is the Universal Supremacy promised to him, that should work the first Mira-

cle, any more than to him that should first Preach the Gospel to the *Jews*?

Rest. V. He first Preaches to the Gentiles.

Vind. This I have before noted to be thought by some, to be the Completion of our Saviour's Prediction of building his Church upon him. But neither this, nor his Preaching first to the *Jews*, nor both of them together; has any the least Intimation annext to it, or them, of the Supremacy you are so fond of, and which you would with all your heart prove to belong to him, but that you cannot.

Rest. VI. He is the first to whom their Vocation was revealed.

Vind. Ergo he had an Universal Supremacy. This is such trifling I am ashamed of it. And I cannot but wonder, what Opinion you have of our Understandings, that you can think it should ever pass with us for arguing. All I can collect from such poor Impertinent Suggestions, as you have here heaped together, is only this, that you would say something to the purpose, but you find the Case defenceless, and cannot.

Rest. Now I think I shall do your Business effectually.

Vind. Then I hope you have some better Argument in store, than any of these foregoing useless Observations.

Rest. VII. He is the first that gives a definitive Sentence, in the Council at Jerusalem.

Vind. Can you make that out? And if you could, would that prove an Universal Supremacy?

Rest. Do you doubt it?

Vind. First, How do you make good your Assertion, that St. Peter gave the definitive Sentence amongst the Apostles?

Rest. Will you not believe your Eyes?

Vind. You

Vind. You will not always permit me to do it ; witness Transubstantiation. But what do my Eyes tell me, that this Apostle spake first in that Council ?

Rest. Most certainly.

Vind. But does his speaking first shew that he gave the first definitive Sentence. If he gave no definitive Sentence, he did not give a First.

Rest. Why, Do you question that ?

Vind. And so must you too, if you will be persuaded carefully to attend to what he said. He declared, * that God had made him the happy Instrument, of first publishing the Gospel to the *Gentiles*, and since they were become Converts to Christianity, and had received the Holy Ghost, he did not see what reason there could be, to require of them the Observation of the *Mosaick* Law, by which they could not hope to be justified, but only by Faith in Christ, and Obedience to his Gospel.

Rest. Is not this a definitive Sentence ?

Vind. No sure ; it looks more like a Proposal at the Opening of the Session. And so I should have thought it, but that we are told there had *been much disputing* before. Yet it certainly comes too soon for a definitive Sentence. For what President of any tolerable Understanding and Integrity ever gave a definitive Sentence, before the Cause was fully heard ? Or what need would there be, to debate about it, after the definitive Sentence were given ? Yet † after this *Barnabas* and *Paul* spake to the same purpose, tho' not so fully ; and all this before the definitive Sentence.

Rest. What is a definitive Sentence, if you will not allow *St. Peter's* to be so ?

* *Acts* xv. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

† *V.* 12.

Vind. That of St. James, which follows after the rest had delivered their Minds, is undeniably a *definitive Sentence*. He declares, * how God had *visited the Gentiles to take out of them a People for his Name*. And when the others had been heard, like the President of an Assembly, he concludes all with his Determination, according to the Opinion of those who had spoken before him; but more fully and particularly, and in such a manner, that they all seem readily and unanimously to have acquiesced in it, and consented to it. And here it is observable. 1. He gave his Sentence last, as the Result of their Debates, which St. Peter did not. 2. He did it in an Authoritative manner, and as became one in his Station. *Κεῖνω*, says he, as our Translation rightly has it, *my Sentence, or Determination is*.

Rest. You know I do not allow of your Translation, but blame your Author, for being led into an Error by it, and demand of him to *prove*, that that Verb *has no other Signification, than what your Bible gives it*.

Vind. This is to mislead your Reader, and carry him off from the Point you were upon. For the proper Question is not, whether this be the only Signification of the Verb *Κεῖνω*, but whether it be not as true and genuine a Signification as any it has. And this you do not pretend to contradict, because you know you cannot, and would abundantly shame your self if you should attempt it. Nay, in this very same Page you plainly acknowledge it, only you would not have it thought to signify so here, because it is not for your purpose that it should. So that your finding fault with our Translation, shews only your good Inclina-

* Verse 13, &c.

tion towards it, and that you would pick a quarrel with it if you could tell how ; but does not at all invalidate what our Author has said. 3. St. James's Determination, not St. Peter's, was what they all agreed in: For so was the Decree of the Council ; * *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden, than these necessary things, that ye abstain from Meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things strangled, and from Fornication, the self same particulars whereof St. James's Determination consisted.* Here is plain Proof that it was St. James, and none other of the Apostles that presided in, and put an end to that Council. And now tell me sincerely, my good Friend, what is become of all your Observations from *the Acts of the Apostles*? The rest of them signify nothing to the Disquisition we are upon ; and this, which alone is to the Point, is false and not to be maintained. Nor is this my Doctrine only, but what the great St. Chrysostom has taught long before me, testifying of St. James, that ἐκεῖνος ὡς ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐγκρατευσάμενος, † *he was invested with the chief Power there, contrary to your Conceit of St. Peter's Presidency amongst them.* And not only so, but a little after, St. Peter, says he, *delivered himself with the greater earnestness, but this Apostle the more sedately, || as it always becomes those in greater Power to do.* And again, Τί ὃ κείνῳ ἐγώ. *What is this, I determine, or my Sentence is?* ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω ταῦτο namely, as much as to say, *I speak this Authoritatively.* Thus undeniably is this Venerable Father an Advocate for our Translation, and thus expressly does he declare for St. James's presiding, and having the chief Power in

* V. 28, 29.

† In loc.

|| Οὕτως ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν μεγάλῃ δυναστείᾳ ποιεῖν.

that Synod. The same also says *Hesychius* of Jerusalem * Πέτρος διμνηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ, &c. Peter speaks it, but St. James determines ---- and his Determination was not to be set aside, nor his Sentence to be slighted. And you will find it to very little purpose, to set up your groundless Fancies against the Authority of such Men, and the plain Evidence I have brought against you. You may go on, if you like it, and say as you do, † That St. James, as President, gave his definitive Sentence, is most false, is most untrue. But I have now shewn fully, that it is most true, and your Complaint of our Translators, is groundless, and highly unreasonable. Whence it follows, that this Assertion, after all your sly endeavours to evade it, is a strong, and invincible Argument against St. Peter's Primacy, if by Primacy you mean the Supremacy you have been pleading for.

Rest. It is time now to call another Cause.

Vind. Let me beg a Word or two more with you first as to this.

Rest. I thought you had shot all your Powder by this time.

Vind. Then I must let you know, I have not. Neither can I dismiss it without my former Question, what Promise have you, that he who should Preside in this Council, should be supreme Pastor of the whole Church? Or what other Title to this Supremacy can you plead, from what was said, or acted therein? It is matter of Fact, that you will not allow St. James such a supereminent Jurisdiction, tho' I have proved him to have presided there. And it is too much to expect, it to be yielded to St. Peter, whom I have proved to

* Phot. Biblioth. CCLXXV. pag. 1526.

† C. R. pag. 19, 20.

have been and acted there, only as a Fellow-Apostle.

Rest. Have you done yet?

Vind. Before I answer you pray tell me, whether you have any thing farther to urge for this Supremacy, either from Scripture, or Tradition?

Rest. Not at this time.

Vind. Then let me put another Question, and be so kind as to return me an ingenuous Answer to it. Supposing *St. Peter* had in truth had such an unlimited Supremacy as you imagine, how would you prove the Pope to have the same?

Rest. It descends to him as the Successor of *St. Peter*.

Vind. Do you take this to be Proof? *St. Peter* had some extraordinary Powers as an Apostle, which were to dye with him, as well as others that were to descend to such as should come after him; and how shall I know that this Supremacy was not one of the former sort?

Rest. I take that for granted.

Vind. So I suppose, because I am sure you have no way proved it. Well, but let me ask you again, if *St. Peter* had such a Supremacy, how came he to leave it any more to *Rome*, than to *Antioch*? Your selves own he was Bishop there, before he was at *Rome*, and for divers Years together, for Seven Years says your Historian * *Baronius*. And how came it to pass, he did not leave that See as much Supreme in the Eastern, as that of *Rome*, in the Western part of the World? What Evidence is there of his designing so vast a Disproportion between his Two Successors? Or how does it appear, that he might leave his Supremacy where he would? By what Charter might his Successors

* Annal. Tom. I. 39, 21.

at *Rome* claim a Supremacy over, not only those at *Antioch*, but even over *St. John* and any other of the Apostles, if any were permitted to out-live *St. Peter*? These are such Absurdities, that it is much better presuming them, than attempting the Proof of them. And yet till these, and divers other like Enquiries are satisfactorily resolved, that Universal Supremacy, upon which you so unwarrantably value your selves, must unavoidably stand but in a tottering Condition.

Rest. In your Opinion.

Vind. And in the Opinion of all understanding and impartial Judges, and some of your own Communion, and of eminent Station amongst you, and even of the Highest.

Rest. So you make your People believe.

Vind. And so have some of yours believed and taught. Take this instance for the present, from the Author of a Discourse, entituled, *Moyens surs & Honestes pour la Conversion des tous les Heretiques*, Printed at *Cologne* in the Year 1681.

Rest. What says he?

Vind. He says * *Cardinal Cusanus* confirms what *St. Gregory* had told us before. *We read*, says the Cardinal, † *that the Three first Patriarchs, of Rome, of Alexandria, and of Antioch, and together with these all the Bishops that were under them, sate in St. Peter's Chair.* And as if this were not enough, that Author adds, *Que l'on lise les écrites de Gregoire, &c.* Let any one read the Writings of the Popes, *Gregory, Gelasius, and Leo*, and he will find they all acknowledge all good Bishops to be *St. Peter's Successors*, and tho' sometimes they have not fail'd to discover ambitious Inclinations, and a desire of subjecting other Bishops to them, yet not as Heads of the Church, and yet

* Tom. i. p. 67, 68.

† Cus. l. i. c. 14.

less by virtue of any Text of Scripture. Neither is it to be observed for the first Five Centuries, that any ever had the Face to alledge one single Passage in the sacred Writings, for establishing the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

Rest. Have you done now ?

Vind. I thought I had : But another like Passage comes in my way ; and it is of your great Champion *Bellarmin*, who after he had sifted this Point as thoroughly, and been as zealous and industrious in maintaining and establishing it, as any one of your Party ever was, is yet forced to admit, that * *the Scriptures do no where expressly declare the Bishop of Rome to be St. Peter's Successor.* And if so, much less do they any where invest him with an Universal Supremacy over the Church of Christ. But enough of this.

Rest. † Your Author argues against this Supremacy, from the Civil States, and the several Governments of the World.

Vind. The several Pages you spend upon this Topick I might well pass over, as of no concern to us, because you all along proceed upon a Supposition of that Supremacy, which it were your business to prove, if you could, and which I hope I have clearly disproved. The main of your Argument lies in this, that a single Universal Monarch must in all appearance govern the Church best. And to prove this, as our Author argues against it from the Civil State, so do you for it. And particularly from the times of *Augustus*, in which you say was greater Peace than since the Division of the Empire. Against which Doctrine of yours a late Learned || Author has undertaken to

* De Rom. Pontif. l. 2. c. 12.

† C. R. p. 22. &c.

|| Jani templum Christo nascente reformatum, Authore Joanne Masson M. A.

prove, there was not so constant and lasting a Peace through the Empire in his time as is commonly supposed. And yet were your Supposition taken for truth, you seem to have forgot that the Growth of the Empire was at length the Cause of its own Destruction. This not only * *Horace* testifies, but † *Florus* and || *Livy*, and * *Tacitus*, and besides these † *St. Augustine*.

Rest. You say you have disproved the Supremacy we contend for.

Vind. Yes, and might have done it much more largely had I thought it necessary. And yet I have one Observation still behind, in relation to this Supremacy: Namely, that we have very good Evidence against it. It not only has no Foundation, either in Scripture or Primitive Antiquity, but we meet with such Occurrences in the Ancient Writers, as manifest it to have been perfectly unknown in their Times.

Rest. Pray let us hear some of them.

Vind. In the first place, see with what singular Familiarity, the other Bishops then treated the Bishop of *Rome*; how they addressed themselves to him as a Fellow-Bishop, not as to a Supreme Governor over them all. How oft do they, and others, call him || *Colleague*, * *Brother*, † *most dear Brother*, or *most beloved Pope*, or Bishop, for || so

* L. V. Od. xvi. ad *Romanos*.

† L. 3. c. 12.

|| L. i. Exord.

* L. 2. *Histor.* p. 347, 348.

† De Civ. Dei, i. 18. c. 45.

|| Vinc. Lir. Common. p. 323. Edit. Baluz. B. Cypr. Ep. 9, & 55.

* Id. Ep. 44, 45, 47, 48, 60, & alibi passim.

† Gest. Purgat. Cecil. & Fel. p. 98, 99. B. Hieron. c. Lucif. Ep. 58. c. 9.

|| B. Cypr. Ep. 8, 23, 30, 31, 36. B. Aug. ep. 11, 13, 14, 31. B. Hieron. ad Pammach. ep. 61. B. Athanas. Apol. 2. p. 759.

the Word then signified, * *Fellow Minister*, and again barely † *Bishop of the Romans*? *Firmilian* of *Cappadocia* makes no difficulty, to tax *Pope Stephen*, || with open and manifest Folly. *St. Cyprian* in the Council of *Carthage*, declares against an universally Supreme, as no way agreeable to the Christian Church. None of us, say he, * makes himself a *Bishop of Bishops*, or compells his Colleagues by a *Tyrannical Terror*, to a necessity of obeying, seeing every Bishop is at his own disposal, according to the Extent of his Liberty and Power, and can no more be judged by another, than he can judge another. *St. Augustin* seems to have apprehended no such Difference between the fore-named *Stephen* and *St. Cyprian*, when he says † *They were Two Bishops of most eminent Churches, the Roman and the Carthaginian*. I have noted before how loudly *Pope Gregory the Great* declaimed against an Universal Bishop, as the Fore-runner of Antichrist; and that the Council of *Chalcedon* allotted the Primacy of Order to the See of *Rome*, not because the Bishop there was Universal Pastor; but because *Rome* had a greater regard due to it, as being the Imperial City; and the second Place to *Constantinople*, as a sort of *New Rome*. And thus it is ordered likewise in *Justinian's Novels*. Θεωροῦντες καὶ τὰς αὐτῶν ὁρᾶς, &c. || We decree according to the Decisions of the Four Holy Councils, that the most holy Pope of Old *Rome* take place of all other Bishops; and the most blessed Archbishop of *Constantinople*, the *New Rome*, hold the second Rank, and be preferred before all others. which Constitutions I take to explain that of * *Irenæus*, that

* Συλλειτουργόν, Euseb. H. E. l. 7. c. 30. Socrat. l. 4. c. 12. Concil. Chalced. Epist. vi. Theodorit. H. E. l. 5. c. 8.

† Gest. Purgat. ubi supra. || Apud B. Cypri. Ep. 75.

* P. 229.

† De unico Baptismo. c. 14.

|| Nov. 131.

* Adv. Hær. l. 3. c. 3.

the Faithful all about flocked to *Rome*, *propter potentiorē Principalitatem*, because of the peculiar Power and Privileges that belonged to it; not by any Divine Right, but as given it by * Councils, and † Emperors. I take also the sixth Canon of the great *Nicene Council* to be very apposite to our purpose, which gives the Bishops of *Alexandria* Power over *Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis*, in like manner as the Bishop of *Rome* has over the Subjects of his See. Which must necessarily imply the *Roman Bishop*, || to have a limited Jurisdiction, confined to his own Patriarchate, inasmuch as otherwise it could not be like that of the *Alexandrian*, and other Eastern Patriarchs. Nor ought the Testimony of *St. Jerom* to *Evagrius*, opposite enough to such an extravagant Demand as this is, to be forgotten. * *Ubiunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, &c. Wheresoever there be a Bishop, whether at the magnificent City of Rome, or the little Eugubium, at flourishing Constantinople, or disregarded Rhegium, at renowned Alexandria, or the obscurer Tanis, he is of the same Merit and Priesthood. The Power of Riches, and the Meanness of Poverty, does not make a Bishop either Higher, or Lower. But they are all Successors of the Apostles.* Which words cannot be wrested so as to make it probable, that *St. Jerom* thought one Apostle to have been by Divine Institution, Superior or Inferior to any of his Brethren. And this *St. Cyprian* positively attests, † *Hoc erant cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, &c. What Peter was the same also were the other Apostles, endued with a like Partnership of Honour and Power. And if the Apostles were all of like Power and Authority,*

* As but now shewn.

† Vid. Platin. in vit. Bonifac. 3.

|| Vid. Balf. Zon. & Arist.

* Ep. 85.

† De Unit. Eccl.

none of their Successors, as such, can claim a Superiority over any of their other Fellow-Bishops. This Position St. *Jerome* has here laid down; and it is besides a natural Inference, from the foregoing Words of St. *Cyprian*. And yet farther, had the Popes been anciently owned as Supreme Governors of the Church, they would have had the Right of Convening General Councils, * which it is certain they had not; they would have Presided in all of them, and more especially in the first and most venerable amongst them, † which yet they did not; and would at last have had the sole Power of confirming their Decrees; ‡ but this they had not. Appeals from all Places would

* *Vid. Euseb. de vit. Constant. l. 3. c. 6. Theod. H. E. l. 1. c. 7. l. 2. c. 8. l. 4. c. 7. l. 5. c. 9. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. l. 5. in Proam. Sozom. l. 1. c. 17. l. 7. c. 7. Evagr. l. 1. c. 3. l. 2. c. 2. Leo. Pap. Epist. 9. ad Theodos. Imp. Conc. Nic. l. 1. c. 1. p. 105, & l. 2. c. 5. p. 154, 155. Conc. Constant. p. 945. Conc. Ephes. Act. 1. p. 446. Conc. Chalced. Act. 3. p. 380, & 461, & Act. 11. p. 684, & Par. 3. c. 2. p. 833. Du Pin de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Dissertat. 4. p. 336. & Nouv. Biblioth. Edit. Batav. To. 2. p. 318. & To. 4. p. 83, 292, 319, 334, 337. Richer. Hist. Conc. gen. l. 1. c. 2. n. 2, 3. c. 5. n. 1. c. 8. n. 10, 11, 12, 13. Quesnel. Dissert. 1. de vit. & reb. gest. Leonis M. p. 292. Casaub. de Libert. Eccl. p. 195. Edit. 4to.*

† Richerius concludes all the Patriarchs to have Presided in the Nicene Council. Hist. Conc. Gen. l. 1. c. 2. n. 8. Others relate that Hosius did, and it is visible that his Name stands at the Head of the Subscriptions, and Victor and Vincentius the Pope's Legates next after him. Concil. Labb. and Cossart. To. 2. p. 50. Thus much Baronius owns; only he would needs have Hosius to be the Pope's Legate. Annal. To. 3. Ann. 325. 20. But without any good Authority, the Historians of those times giving no intimation of any such Substitution. So Nectarius of Constantinople subscribed first to the Council held at that City. Conc. Constantin. p. 555. And Cyril at Ephesus. p. 690. Κεφαλὴ τῶν Συνελεγεμένων ἀγιωτάτων ἐπισκόπων Κύριλλος. Relat. Act. Ephes. c. 60. See also Sozom. l. 7. c. 7. Evagr. l. 2. c. 18. Phot. Epist. ad Mich. Bulgar. Princ. Richer. l. 1. c. 7. n. 5. Du Pin Nouv. Bibl. To. 2. p. 318, & p. 345.

‡ Euseb. de vit. Constant. l. 1. c. 37. Sozom. l. 7. c. 9. Justell. Cod. Can. &c. To. 1. p. 310.

have

have been constantly held, to have of right belonged to them, * but they were not. Divers other Objections might likewise be brought against this pretended Supremacy, and much ampler Proof of what is here said, but that I am unwilling to swell this Answer to too great a length. For which reason I refer any one who desires fuller satisfaction, in this Controversy, to the Learned Dr. *Barrow's* impregnable Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. A Book that highly deserves to have been translated, into other Languages, for the Benefit of Foreigners, most of whom are now wholly unacquainted with it, or not capable of understanding it.

Rest. I have told you, † this is one of those Books which have had all the most considerable things in them thoroughly answered, many Years before the Authors of them were born.

Vind. Why then may they not be answered, now the Authors of them have been so long dead? They stand as so many lasting Monuments of Reproach to your Party, in that they have so effectually evinced the great Unreasonableness and Falsity of your Religion, and not one amongst you all has had the Courage, in a series of so many Years, to confute them; and yet ye will not yield your selves convinced.

Rest. Have a little patience, I have given my Word, that || I shall prove all the Objections worth any

* B. Cypr. Ep. 59. p. 136, 137. Can. Apost. 37. Conc. Nic. Can. 5. Conc. Constantinop. Can. 2. & 6. Conc. Antioch. Can. 15. Conc. Chalced. Can. 9. & 17. Conc. Carthag. Can. 31. *una cum notis Balf. Zon. & Arist. Conc. Milev 2. Can. 22. B. Aug. Ep. 162. Sozom. H. E. l. 8. c. 26. Socrat. l. 2. c. 20. Du Pin Nouv. Bibl. to. 1. p. 218. & de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Dissertat. 2. cap. 1. §. 1, 2, 3, 4. &c.*

† C. R. p. 98.

|| Ibid.

notice in them, to have been thorowly answered long ago.

Vind. I will wait for your notable Performance; and if you please you may begin with this *Treatise* of Dr. Barrow. But I would advise you as a Friend to beware of such a difficult Undertaking, least it happen to you, as it did several Years since to a Convent in Portugal, who had agreed amongst themselves to answer Bishop *Stillington's* excellent Vindication of Archbishop *Laud's* Conference with *Fisher*, but when they had gone about half way, found their Task too hard for them, and so were forced to desist. And if you will venture upon it, when your hand is in, you would do well to answer some of your own Writers too. And particularly *Scotus* in 4. dist. 24. *Corubensis* l. 4. q. 1. *Cajetanus* de Primatu Papæ. *Bannes* in 2. quæst. 1. art. 10. whom you will find to give their Opinion against you. *

Rest. Your Author gives you a goodly Notion of the Unity of the Church.

Vind. Hold Sir, I perceive that but Two Pages forward, you recur to the Supremacy; and therefore if you please, we will go on with that a little farther, before we come to your goodly Notion.

Rest. I tell you then, the Ancient Fathers were thorowpac'd Papists, as every one knows.

Vind. Can you prove, what you say every one knows?

Rest. I give you Two Authorities for it, and tell you, I have a great many more in reserve.

Vind. Do these two say, every one knows all the rest were of their mind?

Rest. I do not say that; but only that by these

* *Du Pin de Antiq. Eccl. Disciplin Dissert.* 4. p. 334.

† *C. S.* p. 14.

whom I name, and those others which you are to guess at, the Case is so plain that you must be unreasonable, if you will not allow that *every one knows it.*

Vind. How does that appear ?

Rest. I could have made it appear, and * *could have quoted many of the Fathers upon this matter, but for brevity sake I only mention two of great Authority, St. Prosper, and St. Leo. And what can you say to these two ?*

Vind. As to your Flourish of many more, so long as none of them make their appearance, I have nothing to say. But as to these *Two* I answer first, to prove from hence the Universal Consent of the Writers of those times, is a sort of Deduction you will not allow of in another. As I shall easily make apparent. I have cited St. Cyprian, and St. Jerom, Two Fathers of far greater Character, for their Writings than yours, to give Testimony against your *Romish* Supremacy ; and tho' they do it very fully, and tho' moreover I have produced divers other Fathers, as also some of your own Writers to corroborate their Evidence ; I am persuaded you will not admit of this as sufficient Proof, that the Ancient Fathers were all Antipapists. And yet unless you will allow my many more, and more pertinent Testimonies to prove for the generality of the Ancient Fathers, there is no Reason to expect I should allow your much fewer, and less pertinent. But farther, as to your two Authorities ; I observe the first is out of a Poem, of *Prosper Aquitanicus*, and the other out of a Panegyrick of Pope Leo ; and *Poets* and *Panegyrist's* being wont frequently to give a loose to their Phancies, you cannot build

* C. R. p. 28.

much upon a particular Phrase or Expression in them. And accordingly, their unusual Flights are never to be reckoned upon, as of equal Authority, with the plain Expressions of graver and more instructive Writers. But to proceed yet farther, and consider these Passages more particularly; The Words of your Citation out of *Prosper* are these, as you render them in *English*. *Rome, Peter's Seat, which to the World is made the Head of Pastoral Honour. Whatever she does not possess by Arms, she possesses in Religion.* And what would you now infer from this, to prove the *Ancient Fathers* were *thorow-pac'd Papists*?

Rest. Here you see, if you be not willfully blind, *Rome* is declared to be made the *Head of Pastoral Honour*.

Vind. But how, or by whom made so?

Rest. By being *St. Peter's Seat*.

Vind. Prove that. Till you can do it, I must stick to what I have said and proved, that whatsoever Primacy it has, was given it by the Decrees of Councils, and because of it's being the Imperial City. But none of the Ancient Councils ever gave her that exalted Supremacy she now claims to her self.

Rest. *St. Leo* asserts it very plain.

Vind. But the forementioned Councils do not, nor the early Fathers, nor even your *St. Prosper*, who speaking of *Rome*, says indeed, she is made the *Head of Pastoral Honour*; but does not tell you how.

Rest. But what think you of *St. Leo*?

Vind. He says, I own, that *Rome* is made by the *Holy Seat* of *St. Peter*, the *Head of the World*. But I know not whether you will meet with the like Expression, in any other Author. *Vincentius Liri-*

nenfis, I am fure, * uses this fame Phrafe of *Caput Orbis*, concerning *Rome* in a Civil Sense, with respect to its Temporal Power: And if one of your own Popes has thought fit to apply it in an Ecclesiastical, and with respect to the State of the Church, and in a Panegyrick too, I trust this will not supersede all the irrefragable Evidence that is brought against it. Especially if it be considered that in this same Discourse from whence your Words are taken, he speaks of such a Parity betwixt *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, as cannot well consist with a Supremacy in the one, and Subjection in the other. And not only so, but *Cardinal Cusanus*, in the Words cited p. 42. affirms of this same *Leo*, that he has freely owned *all good Bishops* to be *the Successors of St. Peter*; and by consequence that this Succession, either conveys no Supremacy, and so the Pope has no Title to it upon this account, or else conveys too much, and so *All good Bishops* must have it. Either of which Suppositions quite overthrows your Hypothesis. But now were I to give you up this Pope, as an avowed Advocate for your Universal Supremacy, the summ of all were only this; that by the Fifth Century you had found one Christian Writer, a *Roman Bishop*, and so speaking for himself, who in a Rhetorical Oration, declared for the Supremacy of *St. Peter's Seat*, and the Glory of *Rome* upon that account. And yet it is well known, that in the next Age *Gregory the Great*, who sat in the same See, and should understand his own Prerogative, as well as *Leo*, when quarrelling with *John of Constantinople* inveighs severely against him, for taking upon him to be the Universal Bishop, or Head of the Church, in such terms as must

* *Commonit.* 2. p. 366.

inevitably have condemned himself, had he and his Predecessors been guilty of the like Pretence. As I have shewn before. And now to conclude this Head ; I will only note farther, that Expressions of this nature are not to be too much depended upon, least they militate as strongly against, as for you. St. *Augustine* is expressly styled * *Summus Christi Pontifex*, Christ's Supreme, or Chief High Priest ; which nevertheless will not pass with you for a Proof, that the Universal Supremacy was then at *Hippo*. So was † also St. *Germain* Bishop of *Paris* in the Sixth Century styled, by *Venantius Fortunatus* ; and St. *Basil* || not only tells St. *Athanasius*, that he took care of all the Churches in like manner as of his own, but expressly affirms, that they fled to him, ὡς πρὸς ὁμὴν κεφαλῆς καὶ σώματος, as the Head of the whole. The Title to the supposititious Epistle of St. *Clement* to St. *James* runs thus ; *Clement to our Lord James, Bishop of Bishops, President over the Holy Catholick Church at Jerusalem, and such others as are any where settled by God's Providence, &c.*

Rest. Neither this Title, nor the Epistle it belongs to, is genuine, as you cannot but own.

Vind. So I told you ; but yet I mention it, because unless you will suppose the Author to be infatuated, you must believe him to speak in the Language of the Times he wrote in, and that it was not then unusual to ascribe these excessive Titles to other Bishops, besides him at *Rome*. And to convince you, these high strains, in their Addresses to the more eminent Prelates, were not so wonderful as you may possibly apprehend, take another to a later Bishop of the same Church of

* *B. Aug. Ep. 36.*
|| *Epist. 52.*

† *Lib. 11. Ep. 13.*

Jerusalem. You may find it in one of *Avitus Viennensis's* Epistles, published not many Years since, by the Learned Jesuit *Sirmondus*, in these Words.

** Exercet Apostolatus vester concessos à Divinitate primatus, &c.* Your Apostleship exercises the Primacy granted you by God, and studies to let the World see, that you possess the chief Place in the Universal Church, not only by Privilege, but by your Merits. If this had been said of the Bishop of Rome, how would you have pleased your selves with it? It would have done you more service, than what you have collected from, either *Prosper*, or *Leo*; which shews how little stress is to be laid upon either of their Assertions. And now, if you please, I am at leasure to attend to your goodly Notion you was speaking of.

Rest. Your Author I say, † gives you a goodly Notion of the Unity of the Church, that it consists in the common Christianity, wherein all agree.

Vind. And can you disprove this goodly Notion?

Rest. I have already said, || If all Sects agree in some common Principles of Christianity, tho' they have no Ordination, Sacraments, &c. tho' they erect Altar against Altar, &c. tho' they curse and damn one another, &c. yet according to this Notion, they are true Churches, and in Union with the Catholick Church.

Vind. In answer to this, he has told you as you know very well; We must keep God's Commandments too; which they who do not are by no means sound Members of the one Catholick Church; and this implies an Observation of all his Institutions. Those who profess to believe in Christ, and have been baptized into his Name, are hereby become Members of his Church. But if they behave not themselves in other respects, as becomes their holy Pro-

* *Neoc. & Syk. Biblioth. libr. novorum. Vol. 1. p. 279.*

† *C. R. p. 26.*

|| *Ibid.*

feſſion, and particularly if they do not live in a faithful Obedience to their lawful, regular Eccleſiaſtical Superiors, and keep a ſtrict Union with the other Orthodox and orderly Members of the Church, avoiding all Schiſms and unneceſſary Diviſions, they may become putrid gangrened Members, and may come to be cut off, and no way owned by the purer Part of the Church, unleſs upon their ſerious Humiliation and Repentance.

Reſt. Will you pretend to ſay, that ſuch equivocal Chriſtians as theſe, are Members of the Catholick Church ?

Vind. I do, and muſt ſay, as *Catholick* moſt naturally and genuinely ſignifies *Universal*, they are; tho' unworthy Members of it. But if in the other, Eccleſiaſtical ſenſe of the Word, by the Catholick Church be meant, the Orthodox, pure Part of the Church, who faithfully adhere to Chriſt, and endeavour to live up to the Rules of his Goſpel, and that all in its Communion ſhould do ſo too, I confeſs they are not Members of this Church, nor can hope for any Advantage in order to Salvation, by any pretence of Union with it ; but are like Branches cut off from a Tree, that can receive no Juice or Nouriſhment from it, unleſs graſſed again into it.

Reſt. I ſee you are for Obeying Chriſt's Commands, as well as your Author.

Vind. I hope in God I always ſhall be, whatſoever Temptations I meet with to the contrary. And I heartily wiſh you, and your corrupt Church, were more obſervant of them, than you are in divers reſpects. For you know, * without ſuch Obedience there is no Hope of Salvation.

Reſt. This I ſay, † is nothing to the purpoſe.

* St. Matth. 7. 21.

† C. R. p. 27.

Vind. You mean it is not for the purpose of your part of the Church, because her Corruptions are so contrary to divers of these Commandments, that she is forced by way of self-defence, to depreciate this principal Test of true Orthodoxy, and set up others of less Certainty, and several of which are in truth no Tests of it at all. But let me tell you; and I am sure I have very good Authority for it, that no Orthodoxy in Faith, tho' that be necessary too, no such Orthodoxy, I say, no Pretence to an Universal Supremacy, no particular Privileges of any one See above another, will be of any avail in order to the Salvation of any, either Person, or Church, that has not a due Regard to the Commandments of God. Which it is certain your Church has not, in the Worship of Images, the Adoration of the Host, Prayers to Saints and Angels, your *Latin* Service, your withholding the Cup in the blessed Eucharist, &c. Give me leave therefore to tell you, that your Charge against us, of *|| having cut our selves off from you by a causeless Separation*, is groundless and false. For first, it cannot be denied, that both Papists and Reformed joyned together in one Communion, for a considerable Part of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, till Pope *Pius V.* issued out a violent Bull, and so made the first Separation; as our Author has * noted before me. And then again, if we had broke off from you first, this could by no means be reputed *a causeless Separation*, when your Corruptions were become so gross, that we could with no safety to our Souls comply with them. As has been proved over and over.

Rest. I cannot forbear pitying the poor * *silly*

* *Ibid.*

† *C. R. p. 27.*

† *C. S. p. 101.*

Primitive Christians, that knew nothing of this Principle !

Vind. If you had pleased, you might have saved your self the trouble, of this senseless ironical Commiseration. For these *Primitive Christians* were not only for *Obeying God's Commandments* ; but were perfect Strangers to your Twelve additional Articles of the modern *Romish Creed*. And had they been now alive, they would no more have dared to communicate with your Church, in her present Circumstances, with the Errors she has entertained and propagated in these latter Ages, and especially since the Council of *Trent*, than we of the Church of *England* dare. Neither is it pretended by any of our Church, that the Hereticks they condemned were true Members, of the Catholick, meaning of the Regular and Orthodox Church ; but only in a laxer Sense, that they were unsound Members of the Universal Church, as they were Christians, as you here * avowedly hold them to have been.

Rest. † Your Author says, *All Churches agree in this Summary of our Faith called the Creed ; and the Church of Rome her self must think this sufficient for Salvation.*

Vind. And what Objection have you against it.

Rest. First, I say, *If this be sufficient, then Papists are secure, for they admit the Summary.*

Vind. But they have tacked to it Twelve other Articles of their own contriving, and how secure they are in this, deserves your serious Consideration. I cannot yet see why creating new Articles of Faith, unknown to the Scriptures, and the first and best Christians, is not as much Heresy as denying any of the old Ones. I am sure it is an in-

tolerable deviation from the only Rule of Faith, and makes your Faith twice as much as our Saviour and his Apostles ever made it. And it is for this sinful Addition to your Faith, together with your unchristian Practices consonant to it, that we dare not associate our selves with you.

Rest. I think I have sufficiently gravelled your Author here, I ask him whether *the Summary call'd the Creed, be sufficient for the Salvation of a Man, who positively rejects the whole Bible, the Sacraments, and all the Articles of Christianity, not contained in the Summary?*

Vind. By *other Articles* I suppose you mean, the known Truths of Christianity not contained in the Summary; because you will never be able to maintain that there are any other necessary Articles of Faith, purely such. *Petenda* there are, and *Agenda*, Matters of Prayer and Practice, which in a large and general Sense are to be believed, because they are revealed. But what we call the *Credenda* or Articles of Faith, are revealed, because they are to be believed. These are of a Speculative Nature; and of these the Creed commonly called the Apostles Creed, is a sufficient Summary. As has been noted sometime since by the Learned Dr. Hickes, in the second Collection of his excellent *Controversial Letters*, p. 47. Amongst the *Agenda* come the Sacraments, and so are not matters meerly and purely of Faith, as our Author rightly supposes. But in answer to your Inquiry, pray let me ask you again, where there ever was a Man who firmly and sincerely believed the *Summary* or *Creed*, and yet denied the other Articles, or rejected the Bible, or Sacraments. When you have done this you may expect an Answer. At present I shall neither trouble you, nor my Reader, with a needless Dispute about a Non-entity.

Rest. * *The Council of Trent has added no new Articles to the Creed ; and we defy him and all his Party to prove that one new Article has been added to the old.*

Vind. A bold Challenge indeed ! but strutting and hectoring with some People supplies the room of Arguments. Do but read over Pope Pius's Creed, and you must be blind, if you do not see good store of new *Articles* in it. For pray Sir, in which of the old *Articles* are you taught the Supremacy of the Pope, and Maternity of the Roman Church, the Adoration of the Host, the Worship of Images, the withholding the Cup in direct contradiction to our Saviour's Institution, Invocation of Saints or Angels, the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, and Purgatory, the Use of Indulgences, &c. You may read over the *Summary* a Thousand times, and with all the Diligence and Attention that may be, and yet not be able at last to fish any one of all these *Articles* out of it. And can any thing be more assuming, than yet to challenge your Adversaries to shew any one new *Article* in your new Creed ? Can any thing be more insincere, than to say this is only an Explanation of the former Creeds ? Good Sir, do not take us all for Children, that will presently be frightened by big Words, and haughty Pretences, tho' ever so false and unreasonable. Your additional *Articles* are perfectly New, and not Explanations of the Old, and all your confident Pretences to the contrary will never disprove it.

Rest. May not we explain the Ancient Creeds, as the Councils of Nice, Chalcedon, and Ephesus, &c. had done long before ?

Vind. I will not take notice of your putting *Chalcedon* before *Ephesus*, instead of *Constantinople*; but shall content my self to tell you, what I have already intimated, that tho' these Councils did indeed explain the Articles of former Creeds, by enquiring into the true meaning of them, and condemning their Opposers; yet this will do your Church no good, which has not explained the Ancient Creeds, but added many new Articles of her own, that have no Relation to them, nor ever were in any of them. This is our Accusation; and we require something more than a groundless Denial, in Answer to it. *

* See this excellently well argued by the Learned Dr. Hickes, in the first Volume of his nervous Controversial Letters Chap. X. pag. 191, and 192. You know Vincentius Lirinensis compares the Ancient Creed, as to it's Parts, to the Limbs and Members of a Child's Body, which though they grow and increase to manly Stature, yet remain the same without Addition or Change. And if you can fairly shew, that your additional Definitions in Pius IVth's Creed, are only the growth and increase of the Limbs and Parts of the ancient Creed, then I will confess, that it is only increased by them, and differs no more from the ancient Creed, than a Man from a Boy or Child. You know he also compares the Articles of the old Faith to grains of Wheat cast into the Ground, which in process of time grow and increase, and get a new Form and outward Appearance, without any change of their Nature; and though they multiply, yet they multiply in the same kind of Grain, which are all wholesome Wheat, and not Tares, or poisonous Weeds. According to which Similitude, if you undertake to deduce your additional Doctrines and Definitions, from any of the old Principles or Articles of Faith, I must beg leave to put you in remembrance so to do it, as that the deduced Doctrines may appear to retain the Nature of the respective old Articles, from which you deduce them, and not be of another kind: If you can do this, you will do your Church the best Service that ever Man yet did it, much better than Bellarmin, or the Bishop of Meaux

Rest. I

Rest. I am much offended at his next Answer, that *the Sacraments* are not a Part of *our Faith*, tho' *divinely Instituted*, and *divinely Revealed*.

Vind. He does not deny that they ought to be religiously received, and whatever is revealed concerning them to be stedfastly believed. But he looks upon them as *Divine Institutions*, *Signs* and *Seals* of *our Faith*; and so reckons them amongst the *Agenda*, rather than the *Credenda* of our Religion, as I noted before. And what great Inconvenience there is in this, that should so highly displease you, I do not see.

Rest. Next he says, † *We have more Sects among us than you have among you*, and that his Church is no more answerable for those that break off from her, than we are for those that break off from us.

Vind. As to the former of these Charges, there needs only to read his Words, to make it appear just and reasonable. If a Church, says his Gentleman, † is answerable for all that break off from her, then you have all these Sects to reckon for, and us too, which is one more. This is no less than Demonstration. And the other is very like it. His Popish Lord has denied, that a Church is answerable for

did it; and for your Performance you'll deserve a Monument of everlasting Honour, both from her, and ours. But if you cannot do this we must still maintain, that Pius's Creed is not *profectus fidei*, but *permutatio*, not an increase, but a change of the old Faith, and new not only in the manner, but matter thereof, quite of another kind, and different and disagreeing from the old Creed, and what was taught as necessary to Salvation in the ancient Christian Church, &c.

† C. R. p. 33.

* Pag. 34.

† C. S. p. 19.

those

those who break off from her, because they are no longer of her. Therefore says his Gentleman very rightly, † *We are not answerable for the Sects which break off from our Church.* Here is a natural and undeniable Inference, from the Lord's Position; which you had a mind to find fault with, but could not; and therefore was forced to change the State of the Question, by turning it into a comparative Assertion; but all to no purpose. For thus you misrepresent his Words. *He says, that his Church is no more answerable for those that break off from her, than we are for those that break off from us.* Whether this be charging him fairly, let any Man judge. But since you will have it so, I must take liberty to affirm, that you are much more answerable for those who have broken off from you, than our Church is, for such as have left her, because she is not guilty of those gross Corruptions, both in Doctrine and Practice, whereby you have shut up the Door, against such as might otherwise have been desirous of your Communion. Yet this Topick of our unhappy Divisions is what your Missionaries oft insist upon, and glory in, and by this means win over divers of our weaker and less judicious Brethren. But with how little Reason every one may see in an admirably learned and judicious Discourse, written by the Reverend Dr. Hicke, intituled, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England; in answer to her Adversaries, who reproach her with the English Heresies and Schisms; Printed for Walter Kettleby at the Bishop's-Head in St. Pauls Church-yard; which has been twice Published, and the Adversaries challenged to answer*

† C. R. p. 26.

it; but none of them have ever dared to attempt it.

Rest. * *Your Author begins his sixth Section with a stout Argument: The Greek Church, says he, is elder than yours, and therefore your Church broke off from her.*

Vind. And what say you to this?

Rest. I say, Another gallant consequence.

Vind. And do you design that for an Answer?

Rest. Not a full one; and therefore I add, 'tis not Age, or Priority of time, but of Jurisdiction, that gives the Supremacy. And this, I say, I have told you already, and am weary of repeating a thing so often.

Vind. Whether weary of it, or not; you may well be ashamed to have repeated this groundless Pretence of Supremacy so often, unless you could give better Proof of it, than any we have yet met with, or are like to have from you.

Rest. I ask, *Is the Greek Church elder than St. Peter, who fixed his Seat at Rome?*

Vind. You may ask, if you please, whether it be elder than our blessed Saviour? or than all his Apostles, or whatever else you think fit. But the Question with your Adversary is not whether the Greek Church was elder than St. Peter; but whether Christianity was preached, and a Church settled in Greece, before St. Peter came to Rome? that being enough to prove her an Elder Sister against any thing you have said to the contrary.

Rest. † *Other Churches in Great Britain are elder*

* *C. R. p. 35.*

† *Ibid.*

than Canterbury, yet Canterbury has the Primacy over them all.

Vind. That there was a Christian Church in this Island * before the coming of *Augustine*, and consequently before *Canterbury* was a Metropolitcal See, or indeed any See at all, is not denied. But then it is to be remembered, that her Claim over the several Churches of this Province, proceeds only from a known indisputable *Primacy* that has been since given her. And could you give as good Evidence for your *Romish* Supremacy over all, as she can for her Primacy over this part of *England*, we would have no dispute with you upon this account; tho' so long as you retain and impose your known Corruptions, we necessarily must upon others.

Rest. We can tell the Place where, the Time when, the Manner how, and the Persons who first broached their Errors. This they can never do against us, and we defy them altogether to shew the least Innovation in any Point of our Doctrine, which you condemn as erroneous.

Vind. It is so usual with you to boast, and strut, and hector, and challenge, and defy, when you have least reason for it, that whenever I find you at this sport, I am tempted to suspect your Case is bad. And so it proves here. The Original and Progress of your Innovations, have been so oft and so fully made out, and your Churches Errors so irrefragably exposed, amongst others abroad, by † *Chemnitius*, and || *Peter du Moulin*, and as to divers of them so largely by Mr. *

* *Bed. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 2. p. III. Spelm. Conc. To. I. p. 104. &c. Brompt. Chron. Reg. Northumbr. Col. 780.*

† *Exam. Con. Trid.*

|| *Nouvanté du Papisme.*

* *De Cultus Religiosi Objecto; de Auriculari Confessione; de cultibus Religiosis Latinorum; de Extremâ Unctione; & de Pœnis & satisfactionibus.*

Daillée, and at home by Mr. * *Perkins* formerly, and since by Bishop † *Stillingsfleet* as to these Six Points, *The Authority of Tradition, the Canon of Scripture, the use of the Scripture in the Vulgar Tongue, the Merit of good Works, the number of Sacraments, Auricular Confession*; as to *Saint-Worship, and Extreme Unction*, by Dr. ‖ *Claget*; as to *Transubstantiation*, by * *Bishop Cosins*, and Dr. † *Tillotson*; as to the *Celibacy of the Clergy* by Mr. * *Wharton*; as to the *Latin Service, Image-Worship, Communion in one kind, and Tradition*, by Dr. † *Whitby*, to name no more at present, that you have no way of vindicating your selves, but by pretending to condemn your Opposers, whom you see you cannot answer. This you do in a particular manner to Dr. *Allix*, who you say *has exposed himself to the Laughter of all Learned Men, by an Attempt of this Nature*. And I expect you will do as much for these I have here named, or any others that have taken the same care to expose your Corruptions, and caution People against them. And for this necessary Reason, because you are not able to defend them. But believe me Sir, it is no Laughing Matter; as you will find at the last day. And if you think you can vindicate your selves, it is a piece of Justice you owe to your selves. And till you can do this, I am sure you are indispensably obliged to renounce your Er-

* *Demonstration of the Problem.*

† *The Council of Trent examined and disproved.*

‖ *Discourse concerning the Worship of the B. Virgin and the Saints. And concerning the Pretended Sacrament of Extreme Unction.*

* *Hist. Transubstantiationis.*

† *Discourse about Transubstantiation.*

* *Treatise of the Celibacy of the Clergy.*

† *Treatise in confutation of the Latin Service &c. Second instance of the Error of the Church of Rome. Demonstration that the Church of Rome and her Councils have erred; Treatise of Tradition, in 2 Parts.*

rors, and not think it will serve your turn, either before God, or Man, to deride those who have been at the pains of shewing the right Way, and persuading you to walk in it.

Rest. * One would think your Author never had heard any thing of the Infamous Photius.

Vind. Pray have you heard of the more Infamous † Phocas, and his Flatterer Boniface III. and how by his undue Compliances with that Usurper and Murderer, || he obtained the Title you are so highly concerned for? If you had, one would think you should not be so very fond of it.

Rest. There is nothing more notorious, than that the Greek Church owned the Supremacy of ours.

Vind. How do you prove this?

Rest. I bring you three Arguments for it.

Vind. I am apt to think something may be more notorious, than what has nothing better to support it, than these Arguments. But pray let me hear them.

Rest. I. She allowed the Church of Rome to preside in Councils made up of her Bishops.

Vind. If this prove a Supremacy, it will prove that Hosius a Spaniard had the Supremacy over both Greek and Latin Church, at the time of the Nicene Council, and Cyril at the time of the Ephesine, for these Councils were made up of both. But this you know was not so.

Rest. These Bishops moreover call him their Head, and themselves his Members, and testify all manner of

* Ibid.

† Φωκάς οἰνοβάρης, αἰμαχαρής, καὶ πρὸς γυναῖκας ἐπισημνός, βειαρός καὶ θρασυὶς ἐν τῷ φθίσματι ασυμπαθὴς καὶ διεισίδης τῷ τρέπον, καὶ αἰσθητός. Cedren Hist. Compend. p. 404. χείρονα ἔχοντες πρὸς τὴν κακίαν τῶν κατωκέντων ἐν τῇ πόλει. Id. p. 407. Ἀσελγέστατον κένταυρον. Theophylact. Hist. l. 8. c. 10.

|| Plat. in vit. Bonifac. 3.

subje-

subjection to him. The Fathers at Chalcedon, thus address themselves to Leo; Thou governedst the Members as Head.

Vind. The Words of the Council are, * ὦν μὲν, ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ἡγεμόνευες, ἐν τοῖς σὺν τάξιν ἐπέχουσι, *Whom thou governedst, as the Head doth it's Members, by those that supply thy place.* And they were spoken to him only as President of that Council by his Legates, who had discharged this Office amongst them to their great satisfaction. But it is too much to infer from hence an Universal Supremacy, for *Leo*; here being nothing said with relation to the whole Church, but purely to the ordering and management of that single Council. So that effectually to answer this Address of the Council, there needs no more than barely to give the Reader it whole, and in it's own Language. Which you had taken care not to do.

Rest. I gave you also the Words of the *Ephesine* Council, τὰ ἁγία μέλη τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ.

Vind. These are the Words of *Philip* a Presbyter, the Popes Legate in that Council. But they want likewise to be more fully and clearly represented. Τὰ ἁγία μέλη τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ, καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐκβοήσεσιν ὁμνῶχαί τε. *Being holy Members, ye have by your holy Voices, joyned your selves to your holy Head, and by your holy Exclamations.* Where it is to be noted, that this is only an Expression of the Pope's Legate, who be sure would not fail to do what in him lay, to magnify his Master's Character and Power. And yet he represents him as Head of the Council, after the same manner as *St. Peter* was Head of the Apostles; whom I have shewn to have had no Authority over them; and by consequence neither can the Pope have over

* Conc. Chalced. Par. 3. cap. 2. p. 833.

those Bishops, who are not of his Patriarchate.

Rest. The *Constantinopolitan* Fathers say, *ye have called us together as your Members.*

Vind. It is true ; the Fathers met at *Constantinople*, wrote * a respectful Letter to *Damasus* and those assembled with him at *Rome*, thanking them for commiserating their Sufferings, and treating them as Members of the same Body with themselves. But it is much harder to frame an Argument from hence for the Pope's Universal Supremacy, than to answer it when set forth to the best Advantage. There is no subjection at all owned ; and if there had, it must have been not to *Damasus* alone, but since no distinction is made between him and them, to the other Bishops together with him. Which is more than you desire, or would assent to. And thus I have shewn that the Oriental Bishops do not so call the Pope their Head, and themselves his Members, as to testify all, or indeed any, manner of Subjection to him out of the Council.

Rest. II. 'Tis notorious that she, [the Greek Church] allowed the Pope's Jurisdiction over her Patriarchs, Bishops, &c. and that he deposed them, restored others, &c.

Vind. As notorious perhaps as what you pretended before concerning their owning themselves his Subjects. But to your Proof.

Rest. *Sozomen* says it, and *Theodoret*, and *Socrates*.

Vind. Let us hear them in their Order. And begin if you please with *Sozomen*.

Rest. It is in the third Book of his Ecclesiastical History, the second Chapter.

Vind. I suppose you mean the Eighth and Tenth Chapters, where he treats of *Julius's* concern for *St. Athanasius*, *Paul* of *Constantinople*, and two others,

* *Theodorit. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 8.*

† *C. R. p. 37.*

who

who being unjustly deprived of their Bishopricks for their adhering to the *Nicene* Faith, had fled to him for Refuge, and whom he therefore not only received to Communion, but looking upon himself concerned to have a particular regard to all Christians, upon account of the eminent Station wherein he was set, *restored them*, as much as in him lay, *to their several Churches*; affirming, that it was *against Law*, that such Proceedings had been *without informing him*, and that they were *void upon this account*. What Law it was that *Julius* refers to, our Historian does not acquaint us. Nor were his endeavours for the Restoration of these injured Bishops so successful, but that he was forced to make his Complaint to the Emperor *Constans*, and entreat the Assistance of his Power for making them effectual. Which was no very promising Sign of his supereminent Power in this respect, and that it was owned by the *Greek Church*.

Rest. Theodore speaks also to the same effect, in the second Book of his History, Chap. iv.

Vind. Theodore here affirms *Julius* upon *Athanasius's* Complaint, who was then at *Rome*, and so within his Jurisdiction, to have, *in pursuance of a Law, or Canon, of the Church*, summon'd him before him, and call'd his Accusers also to come and make out their Charge against him. This Canon, *Valesius*, a zealous Advocate for your pretended Supremacy, * takes nevertheless to be that which forbids Judgment to be given without hearing both sides, the same that *Athanasius* mentions in his second Apology, p. 799, as founded upon those Words of *St. Paul*, † *Act.*

* In loc.

† *Who ought to have been here before thee, and object if they had ought against me.*

24. 19, together with those of *Festus*, * Ch. 25. 16. Now when the deprived Bishops fled to *Julius* for help against their Adversaries, he might reasonably enough let the adverse Party know it, and desire to hear what they had against them, before he applied himself to the Emperor in their behalf, or tried any other way in order to their Restoration. But this will never prove, that he had of himself full Power to determine the Cause, and do them Right without any other Assistance. As you must needs see.

Rest. Hear farther what *Socrates* says in the Case, in his second Book, ch. v.

Vind. Pardon me, if I think you are again mistaken, because that Fifth Chapter has nothing in it, that will at all suit with your purpose. For which reason I suspect the Passage you aim at, to be here likewise in the Eighth Chapter, where I find these Words. *Κανόνες Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κελεύουσι, μὴ δεῖν παρὰ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης, τὰς ἐκκλησίας κανονίζειν*, that the Churches ought not to make Canons, without the consent of the Roman Bishop, by reason of an Ecclesiastical Canon so ordering. But here you may please to observe, that the Historian does not declare, in what place this Canon was made, when, or by whom, or where it is to be found. And so you cannot look for any Judgment to be made of it a present. But if you shall think fit to produce it at your leasure, you may then expect a farther Answer.

Rest. III. † *The many Appeals made to the Pope, by Patriarchs, Primates, Bishops, &c. is a farther Proof,*

* It is not the manner of the Romans, to deliver any Man to dye, before that he which is accused, have the Accusers face to face, and have Licence to answer for himself, concerning the Crime laid against him.

† C. R. I. 37.

of the Pope's Supremacy being owned in the Greek Church.

Vind. This you assert ; but have not thought fit to acquaint us with one of these Appeals, or to shew us when they were made, and by whom. And so your unsupported Assertion is of no use to you. Especially since from the places referred to p. 48, it will appear that they must have been uncanonical and unnecessary.

Rest. Read St. Augustin's Epistle 162, and you will be convinced of your Author's Mistake.

Vind. I am not first to read that Epistle now ; but it is not conceivable, what mistake of our Author's I can discover by it. You cannot suppose it is to teach me, that the numerous Churches of Asia, and the Swedes, Danes, &c. own the Pope's Supremacy, nor yet that they are all condemned Hereticks, as you assert. Nor can I imagine, why you insist on this Epistle, unless, because it is so long you promised your self the Reader would take it upon trust, rather than be at the pains of looking it over to confute you. St. Augustin speaks indeed of a Catholick Unity diffused over the whole World, but does not say the whole World owned the Pope for their Head. And the African and Carthaginian Canons assure us for that Part of the World, that they did not, by their disallowing of Appeals to him. Speaking also of the Roman Church, he says, in which the Authority of the Apostolical Chair had always a singular sway ; as no doubt it had, and ought to have. But he does not say all other Churches were subject to it. And as to the Title of Apostolical See, this, it is well known, is no more than has been given to those of * Antioch and Jerusalem, to name no more at present.

* Ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ. ἡ Σεύειας. Theod. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 9. Nor was Antioch called only an Aposto-

And this very Father, a little after in this same Epistle, makes mention of * *Apostolical Churches*, in the Plural Number, and thereby undeniably testifies this Epithet, not to imply any Universal Supremacy; unless all these several Churches were invested in it, as well as that of *Rome*. And if you think from this Epistle to prove a Right in the Pope, to require Appeals from other Churches, you ought to know, here is no other Appeal spoken of but of the *Donatists*, whom I hope you will not propound as a proper Example, for the Imitation of all other Churches. Especially if it be farther considered, that this Appeal, tho' directed to *Rome*, was nevertheless not to the Pope, but the Emperor, which I doubt upon second thoughts you will not at all like. Infomuch that had you your self read over this Epistle, at least with any manner of care, I cannot think you would have apprehended it for your Interest, so much as once to put your Reader in mind of it.

Rest. † I wonder your Author does not remember, what was decreed in the Council of *Sardica*; which allows Bishops to appeal to the Pope, in case of Grievance.

Vind. It Allows, pray mark that; it permits such Application, but does not teach, or enjoyn it, as a necessary Duty; as it certainly would, had the Church of *Rome* then had such a supreme Authority and Jurisdiction, as you now pretend to. A

lical Church, but the Seat of *St. Peter* too. Θεόνον τ' Ἀντι-
 χείας μεγαλοπόλεως τ' τῆς ἁγίας Πέτρης. Conc. Chalced. Act. 7. p.
 364. τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Sozom. l. i. c. 2. Exercet Apostolatus
 vester concessos à Divinitate Primatus. Avit. Vienn.

* In like manner as *St. Ambrose* says of Bishops in general
 Episcopus personam habet Christi, and again, Vicarius Domini
 est. In 1 Cor. c. ii.

† Pag. 37.

singular

singular Regard was always had to that See, not only as it was one of the Apostolical Sees, but as Rome was the Imperial City ; as has been noted above. And no wonder therefore, if such who thought themselves grieved, were desirous to have sometimes the Opinion, of so famous a Prelate and his Suffragans, concerning their Cause. But this is no Evidence, that they were necessarily bound to refer their Cause to his Decision, whether they desired it, or not. It is first proposed to the Council for their Approbation, * *Whether in their Opinion such Appeals should be allowed?* Which certainly would not have been done, if the Bishops there assembled had known it to be a necessary Duty, and what was incumbent on them before. The Reference also was to be to Pope *Julius* by Name, without mentioning his Successors, as if he only were to have this Honour paid him. Or if they too were to be concerned in their turns, still it is not left to them to call the matter to their own Consistory, but only to appoint some of the Neighbour-Bishops to rehear the Cause, and give their Opinions of it when desired ; and this a second time, if demanded. Which does not argue the Pope, to have then had any such Supremacy, as is now contended for. And yet as it is, the Learned Mr. *Du Pin* declares, † of this Decree, that *it was never received nor observed in the East. In the West the Bishops of Africa opposed it, and it was long before it was observed in the other Countries of the West.* Which is no small Prejudice to any Claim, that might come to be founded upon it. And yet this is not all. For the Learned Bishop *Beveridge* produces a *Scholium* upon the Fourth Ca-

* Εἰ δοκεῖ ὑμῶν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ.

† *Compendious History of the Church*, Ch. IV. p. 130.

non, which notes farther, that this Canon could not be designed, to settle the Doctrine of Appeals to *Rome*, for these four Reasons. 1. Because so, this Provincial Synod would contradict such as were Oecumenical, and particularly the fifth Canon of the great *Nicene Council*. 2. Because it does not allow all Bishops who are Deposed, to make use of this Remedy, but such only as are Deposed by their Neighbour-Bishops, without taking notice of their Metropolitan or Patriarch. And again, 3. Because this Synod, tho' you are pleased, for what Reason you know best, to call it a General one, consisted only of *Occidentalists*; and so could not oblige the *Greeks*, and the other Eastern Churches. 4. And lastly, Because ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ ἔδαμῶς μέχρι τῆς νῦν σιωπήθεια τοιαύτη περράτηκεν, *this custom had no where obtained in the East to that very day*. And now I leave it to you, to make the best you can of this Council.

Rest. The Greeks * believed the Pope to be Supreme, and so did then all Faithful Christians in the World, for the Reasons expressed in an Imperial Law, published in those Primitive times, viz. That † the Supremacy of the See Apostolick has been established, both by the Merit of St. Peter, who is the Prince of the Episcopal Society, by the Dignity of the City, and by the sacred Authority of a Synod.

Vind. What Precedence the Pope may pretend to, as Successor to St. Peter, and as given him by Canon, has been already noted; as also that a particular Respect was paid him, because of his being Bishop of the Imperial City. And if *Valentinian* and *Theodosius* intended any more here, they must be said out of their great Reverence to the Pope, to have carried the matter farther than they could

* C. R. p. 38.

† Theodos. Novell. Tit. 24.

justify.

justify. But by what follows a little after, they seem only to aim at the rectifying a Disorder committed in the Pope's own Patriarchate, and so which fell properly under his Cognizance and Correction. *Hilary* who called himself a Bishop of *France*, had been chargeable with undue Ordinations of Bishops, displacing some without a competent Authority, and ordaining others into their Places, without consulting the Bishop of the Church of *Rome*, and at last defending what he had done, by armed Force. And *the Peace of the Churches* could not be preserved, if such Irregularities were suffered to pass without Animadversion. And this seems to be the Design of this Law. But if more were intended by it, and it were really to be of Universal Obligation, nevertheless I cannot be persuaded, that a Law of these Emperors should in an Ecclesiastical Affair, over-rule the Canons of General Councils, which the Pope himself is obliged in his Station to observe, as well as other Bishops. Neither do we know at this distance of time, by what unfair means it might have been obtained, for the gratifying of the Pope, rather than the Benefit of the Church. The summ is, that since I have disproved the Pope's Pretended Right to an Universal Supremacy over the whole Church of Christ, were the Passages you cite for it, ever so plain on your side, all you could aim at from hence, were only to shew the Ancient Writers to have differed from one another about it; which were but a poor way of defending it, and will never prove you had just reason to undertake the Defence of it. Wherefore I leave this high, but unreasonable Claim of your Church, I have had so long under consideration; and proceed to another as vain, I mean that of her pretended Infallibility.

Rest.

*Rest. * Your Author says, this is no where, nor can be among Men.*

Vind. And all you offer in disproof of this, is only that Men may have infallible Evidence for some particular Truths and Facts; who yet may be notoriously fallible in the main; or that it is in the Power of Almighty God to preserve Men from Error, which is no Answer at all to our Author, unless you could prove that God actually does this; which you have not done, nor ever can. And so his Assertion stands good against you.

Rest. † Not one of his Quotations proves that the Jewish Church erred in her Doctrine.

Vind. Whether these Quotations prove it, or not, it is past doubt, that they very grossly erred, || when they taught, as well as practised Idolatry, * when their Prophets prophesied falsely, and the People loved to have it so; † when they taught for divine Doctrines the bare Traditions of Men; but most grossly of all || when they denied our blessed Lord to be the Son of God, and their long expected Messias, and persecuted him to the Death, for professing himself to be so. I hope you will not say, they were still infallible. But now as to the places mentioned, *Mal. 2. 8. Ye are departed out of the way, saith the Prophet.*

Rest. This was matter of Practice, as I told you, and so not inconsistent with Infallibility.

Vind. I am apt to think God will never make a Succession of wicked Men Infallible. And yet if he will not, your pretended Infallibility has for divers Ages been but in a bad Con-

* C. R. p. 55,

† Ibid.

|| Judg. 2. 11, 12, 13. & 3. 6. Jer. 44. 15. &c. and multitudes of other places.

* Jer. 5. 31.

† St. Matth. 15. 9.

|| St. Jo. 10. 33. & 19. 7.

dition. But as to what follows, *ye have caused many to stumble at the Law.*

Rest. Yes by their bad Example.

Vind. And why not as well, by their false Doctrines? But pray mark the next words. *Ye have corrupted the Covenant of Levi, saith the Lord,* as much as to say they had vitiated, mis-interpreted, and put strange glosses upon it; which must needs have been by false and erroneous Doctrines. And I am sure this is erring in Doctrine, whether you will allow it to be called so or not.

Rest. The Passage of *Isaiah* is not said of the Jews as a Church, but as a Nation, *Is. i. 5, &c.*

Vind. Did not the Church and Nation both consist of the same Persons?

Rest. Yes.

Vind. Then if the whole Nation erred, I am afraid the Church at that time could not possibly be *Infallible*. But how do you prove the Jews were not here spoken of as a Church?

Rest. The following words manifestly shew it.

Vind. That is easier said than proved.

Rest. Suppose it be said of the Jews as a Church, it is in relation to her Manners, and not her Faith.

Vind. Verse 3, they are complained of for their Ignorance, and Inconsideration; *Israel doth not know, my People doth not consider.* And was this only in relation to their Manners? * Sure you will not say so. But to come to the Words themselves. *From the sole of the Foot even unto the Head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores.* If no soundness at all in them,

* Potest hic locus & de Deo Patre intelligi, sed magis refertur ad filium, quod non cognoverit eum, neque suscepit Populus Israel: cujus diem Abraham vidit, & lætatus est; & in cujus adventu omnium prophetarum vota pendebant. B. Hieron. in loc.

then sure neither in Church, nor State, nor Manners, nor Doctrine.

Rest. The Passage in Jeremiah has the same meaning, *Jerem.* 12. 8, 9.

Vind. If so, the same Answer might serve. But I refer it to your self. Pray consider in what sense the Prophet here calls them, more than once God's *Heritage*, whether they were principally so, as a Church or as a State; and then say this Place is grossly misapplied, if you can.

Rest. 'Tis most untrue, that the Promises he mentions, *Is.* 59. 21, were made to the Jewish Church, or belong literally to her.

Vind. That this Promise was to extend to the Times of the *Messiah*, the best Commentators allow; but I much question whether you will find any amongst them, who will say it was not made primarily to the *Jews*. And your saying 'tis most untrue, is no Argument with me, that it is not most True.

Rest. * He returns again to his old Fallacy of confounding the particular Church of Rome, with the Catholick Church in Communion with the Bishop of Rome.

Vind. No Sir, I dare answer for him, that this is no Fallacy of his, but that by the Church of Rome, he means all in Communion with the Roman Church, and I do not question but you well enough know that to be his meaning. But then you are not to imagine that he will, or can any way agree with you, that that Part of Christendom is the truly Catholick Church. And if I should charge you as guilty of a Fallacy, in groundlessly supposing it to be so, and then arguing upon such your false Supposition, it would be impossible for you to clear your self. It is not the Supremacy

* C. R. p. 56.

of your Bishop, nor the extent of his Dominion, and the Number of his Subjects, nor your arrogating to your selves the Name of the only Catholics, nor any such outward Mark or Note, whereby your Title to this Claim can be made good. The only proper and sure way whereby to judge of you aright, is that our blessed Saviour prescribes for the Discovery of false Prophets. * *By their Fruits ye shall know them.* Whilst your Corruptions both in Faith and Worship are so many and so foul, it is to no purpose to flatter your selves, with the Name of Catholics. You may assume to your selves, as glorious Titles as you please; but it is only by your faithful adherence to the Directions of the Gospel, as understood in the Primitive times, and all the best and purest Ages of our Religion, that you can ever truly entitle your selves to them. And then, but not till then, you may have all Pretences to all the Promises made to the Church in general, and to every Pure and Orthodox Church in particular.

Rest. He grants † *the Promises of God can never fail, if the Condition imply'd be observed.*

Vind. Here he adds something, you did not think it for your purpose to take notice of, namely, that || *We may mistake God's Promises, and not understand them aright.* By which means a Church or a Nation, may think themselves to have a Right to them, when they really have not. Which is the Case of your Church, in respect to both the Supremacy and Infalibility, which she would fain persuade her self and others, were promised to her; when upon Inquiry no such Promise can any where be found.

* St. Matth. 7. 20.

|| C. S. p. 28.

† C. R. p. 57.

Rest. His Assertion that there is still a Condition implied in God's Promises is false.

Vind. This is so apparent a Falsity in you, that I can scarce think it worth confuting. However, since you urge it with such assurance, pray let us have your Proof of it.

Rest. The Promise of the Messiah, and several other are Unconditional.

Vind. This if true, would imply, that several others are Conditional; nor do you so much as pretend the contrary. But I know not how you will ever be able to prove it true. Even the Promise of the Messiah, supposed there would be great need of his Mediation, inasmuch as Mankind could not hope to be saved without him. And since you do not particularly instance in any other, I have good Reason to conclude, you knew of none to instance in.

Rest. The Passages he quotes, are nothing to his purpose.

Vind. So you say. But I observe of three that he has quoted, you nibble only at one of them, without the least Exception to the other two. And in relation to that one all you object is, that the Word Church is most unfairly foisted in by the Author. But give me leave to say this is most unfairly objected by you. For you know very well he does not pretend it to be in the Text, and to let every one see he does not, he has put it in a distinct Character, he has moreover marked it after the manner of a Parenthesis, that the Reader may know it to be his own Addition, intended only to shew, that that Promise or Threat'ning may in Equity belong as naturally to a Church, as the Letter of it does to a Nation. And there appears no Rea-

son, why the Promises made to a Church must be more unconditional, than those made to a State or Nation.

Rest. * *Your Author quotes a Passage out of the Romans, against the Church of the Gentiles, but it makes nothing against us.*

Vind. You own here that a Particular Church may err from the Faith, and by Parity of Reason, a number of particular Churches, as many for instance as are now of your Communion may so err. And if so, where is the Certainty of your Infallibility? If instead of Sweden, Denmark, Greece, &c. be put the Church of Rome, and those others in Communion with her, Germany, France, Spain, &c. these are lamentable Proofs, that if a People do not continue in the goodness of God, and live up to the holy Religion they profess, God forsakes them, delivers them over to their own Delusions, and takes from 'em his Kingdom, and gives it to Nations bringing forth its Fruits. And this in my Opinion is too much against you to be despised.

Rest. † *If nothing can be Infallible, but what is impeccable, as your Author speaks, then no Man knows that Two and Two make Four, that a Part is less than the whole, &c.*

Vind. This is only repeating what you had said a little before, in another dress. And the same Answer will serve here, as formerly, that to make a Man certain of some particular things, does not necessarily imply an Infallibility in him in others. But you put no difference between Knowledge, or Certainty, and Infallibility. As if a Man could not be sure of a sensible Object, a matter of Fact, or a Mathematical Proposition, without being infallibly assured of Transubstantiation, and the other

new Articles of the *Trent Creed*. Which is so irrational and absurd, that nothing can be more.

Rest. What Catholick ever said that the Apostles were, or the Church is Infallible in every thing? What we say is, that the Apostles were, and the Church is infallible in delivering to us the revealed Doctrines of Christ; but in other things we own the Church may be, and has been mistaken.

Vind. As to what you say here concerning the Apostles, I shall have no Dispute with you. My Exceptions to this Passage are only these. First that you proceed here upon your constant Fallacy of applying all Promises made to the Universal Church, to your own particular Roman Church. By which I have told you before, and for fear of being misapprehended, I now tell you again, I mean not the *Roman Diocese*, but those in Communion with it, in whatsoever Nation. To these you groundlessly apply whatsoever Promises are made to the *Catholick Church*. And by this means fall into many and gross Errors. And then that you confidently persist in your Claim of Infallibility, when your Errors and Corruptions are such, that nothing can be a more effectual Confutation of it. As has been abundantly made out from time to time, and more especially in the late King *James's* Reign, when you had all the Liberty and Encouragement you could desire, to vindicate yourselves, if you had known how. Tho' now it seems those Confutations are all vanished, and you can see none of them. Besides, our Author tells you farther, that the Church is represented in Scripture under such different Characters * as are not to be reconciled but by understanding them of different States of the Church, and at different times. And

* C. S. p. 31.

a little after he adds, " But when we distinguish
 " not, and would apply to the most *Corrupt* State,
 " what is said of the most *Glorious*, we must needs
 " fall into many Errors and Mistakes. This is the
 " difficulty under which the Church of *Rome* now
 " labours, She first making her self the *Catholick*
 " Church : And then applying to her self, in this
 " her *corrupt* State, whatever is said of the Church
 " even in her *Perfect*, *Glorious*, and *Triumphant*
 " State ; creates her infinite Trouble, and endless
 " Distinctions , to reconcile these ; which is as
 " impossible to be done, as to make the State of
 " the Church in *Heaven* and upon the *Earth* to be
 " the same : And while the Corruptions in the
 " Church of *Rome* are confessed and lamented by
 " the most Learned, and most Pious in her own
 " Communion. In a word, I see not how you
 will be able to answer that Learned and Inge-
 nious Knight Sir *Edwin Sandys*, who urges, * that
we must take it upon your own words to be true, that
you and your Church cannot possibly err. For as
for your conjectural Evidence out of Scripture, there
seems, as he proceeds, to be as much, or more, for the
King of Spain's not erring, as there is for the Pope's ;
it being said by the wisest, that the heart of the King is
in the hands of God ; a divine Sentence is in his Lips,
and his Mouth shall not transgress in judgment.

Rest. Have you done with this Article?

Vind. With our Author I have, but not with the
 Article it self. For 1. It is a strange thing to me,
 that you should value your selves upon a presumed
 Infallibility, which yet you know not where to
 find, not being agreed amongst your selves where
 to place it, whether in the whole Church, in the Pope
 alone, or with his Cardinals, in a Council alone,

* *Europ. Spec.* p. 203.

or in a Pope or Council together. Against each of which Pretences there lie such invincible Objections as quite overthrow it. As might easily be shewn, but that I am desirous not to enlarge upon this Subject, and the rather because they are so well known as not to need it. And it is a rare Infallibility which you cannot infallibly tell where to find, when you have occasion for it. 2. And it is as precarious and groundless as it is difficult to find out, there being no Foundation for it in Scripture, or Primitive Antiquity, neither of which that I know of ever taught the universal Church to be Infallible in all Matters of Revelation, much less those only of the *Roman* Communion. 3. After all your Presumptions of this nature, you ought to remember, that the *Jewish* Church had as fair Pretences to an Infallibility, as you can have, and yet these did not preserve them from procuring the Death of the Son of God, and * many other grievous Errors; yet it cannot be denied, but they had as full a Charter for Infallibility, as any your Church could ever pretend to. See *Deut.* 17. 10, 11. *And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place (which the Lord shall chuse) shall shew thee, and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee. According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left. And of the Scribes and Pharisees says our Saviour, St. Matth. 23. 2, 3. They sit in Moses seat: All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do. And seeing this did not preserve them from erring*

* *St. Matth.* 15. 6. and 23. 27. and 26. 65, 66. and 27. 83. and *Act.* 5. 28. 29.

very grievously, it is impossible your Church, which has no such Declaration or Injunction concerning it, should ever be able to prove it self more infallible than them. 4. Were this Infallibility as easy to be found, as well grounded, and as certainly to be depended on, as you would have us think still it would be of no use to the generality of Mankind, unless a farther Miracle were wrought for its conveyance. For suppose now a Man comes to me for Instruction of his Ignorance, or Resolution of his Doubts, or Conviction of his Errors, and I tell him he must ask of those who are best able to teach him, if he be able must read and study good Books, and especially the Holy Scriptures, which were given us by Almighty God for the Rule of our Faith and Manners, must pray to God for Direction, and must be very sincere and impartial in all his searches after Truth, and give him what farther Advice I think proper. No say you; he need not give himself all this trouble, for I have an easier and shorter way for him, let him but come over to us, and give up his Judgment to our Infallible Church, to do what she bids him, and believe whatever she teaches him, and his Business is done. Very well says the poor well-meaning Disciple, glad of so convenient a Passage to Heaven, and desirous to be fully instructed concerning it; But pray Sir, how shall I know your Church is Infallible? You cannot question say you the performance of our Saviour's Promise, that *the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*. I do not he replies, I cannot question our blessed Saviour's Veracity; but how shall I infallibly know, either that this Promise implies an Infallibility, or that it is made to your Church more than others? Both which Suppositions I find are not only question'd, but absolutely denied by great numbers of both learned and good Men. Oh! say

you again, we shall easily satisfy these Inquiries. I doubt says he, not so easily ; for I never met with any one yet that could. Yet if this were done, how could I be infallibly sure in whom this Infallibility were seated, considering the many Contests that are among your selves about it, some making * the Pope Infallible, at least † in Conjunction with his Cardinals, some || the Church Diffusive, some only * a Council, and others only † a Council confirmed by the Pope ? And yet again, if this difficulty were got over, what were I the better ? The Sense of the Church Diffusive can never be known, having never been declared by them hitherto, nor ever like to be so for the Future. If in a Council confirmed by the Pope, how shall I infallibly know that it is thus confirmed, who it may be cannot read the Acts and Canons of the Council, not understanding the Language in which they are written ? If in a present living Council, that can speak for themselves and tell their meaning ; where is your Infallibility when there is no Council sitting, as there has not been for a long time ? And yet if there were, how could I and all People, go to them for their Direction, or how were it possible for them to give it ? I know no way but by Writing, and why may I not as well understand the Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, as any Writing

* Stella in S. Luc. c. 22. 31.

† Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 3. Coster. Enchirid. c. 3. p. 136, 137.

|| Alphons. de Castro adv. hæres. l. 1. c. 4. Toftat. in S. Mat. quæst. 13. Papist misrepresented and Repr. ch. 17. p. 41. Bish. Bilson's true Difference, &c. p. 293. *The incomparable Author of Sure-footing*, &c. p. 101, and 115.

* Staplet. Princip. Fidei demonstrat. l. 5. c. 7. Eck. Enchirid. de Conciliis p. 18. Council of Trent. l. 2. p. 125, 142.

† Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 4.

of theirs. No doubt the Holy Ghost could enable the Evangelists and Apostles, or whomsoever he pleased, to express their meaning as fully and intelligibly as these can possibly do. Or if the Pope is to be this Infallible Guide, as the *Jesuits* and others would have him, whether alone, or together with his Cardinals, it is impossible the whole World can flock to him for his Instruction, nor can I in particular, who live so many Hundreds of Miles from him, and it may be have neither Money, Health, nor Leisure for so tedious, tiresome, and expensive a Journey. Here Sir says the Confessor you are over-nice, your Expectations cannot be answered in this manner, nor need they. It is enough, that we who know the infallible Doctrine of the Church take care to explain it to you; which we are sure to do very faithfully. Is this all you make such a noise about, says the *Catechumen*, then it is time for me to look to my self. I see after all your Boast of an Infallible Church, I am to depend alone upon the Voice of my Priest. And if he be not both Faithful and Infallible, I am in a ready way to be deceived to my own Destruction.

Rest. * Such an one must be content to be instructed by his Priest.

Vind. But how shall he be able to satisfy himself, how shall he infallibly know, that his Priest instructs him right? This he can never be sure of, unless his Priest were as Infallible as his Church; which I am sure is more than the Priest himself will pretend to, or you for him. And now Sir

* Si rusticus circa articulos credat suo Episcopo, proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, meretur in credendo, licet sit error, quia tenetur credere, donec ei constet esse contra Ecclesiam *Tolet.* Instruct. Sacerd. l. 4. c. 3. n. 7. Ita & *Gabr. Bish.* l. 3. D. 25. Art. 3. Dub. 1.

what is become of your darling Infallibility? The pretence of it may serve to delude such who do not understand it, and perhaps to get them over to your Communion, but it will stand them in no real stead, when you have got them. But I beg pardon for this Digression, and return to our Author, who next charges you with false Miracles.

VII. *Rest.* * *I own some wicked Members, of the Church of Rome have forged false Miracles, which have been notoriously detected.*

Vind. It is well you will own so much. Tho' it is no more than *Melchior Canus* had owned before you; adding moreover, that these their Feats have been transmitted to Posterity by grave and serious Writers.

Rest. But who detected them?

Vind. Your selves undoubtedly had the best opportunities of doing it if you would; but how well you have done it, I will not say. But let me ask you, did any of you ever go about doing it, till compelled to it by those of the Reformation, exclaiming against you for their gross Abuses in this kind? Let me ask again, how many counterfeit Miracles are still pretended to be wrought on some of your solemn Festivals, and even by your Priests themselves, in the publick Church, and in the Face of numerous Congregations? As is too well known to those who had had occasion to travel into *Italy*, and some other Parts, where your Religion is professed. After which it is very surprizing to hear you offering to

* *C. R.* p. 62.

† *Negare non possumus viros, aliquando gravissimos in divorum præsertim prodigiis describendis, sparsos rumores & excepisse, & scriptis etiam ad posteros retulisse. Loc. Theol. l. II. c. 6.*

compare such as deny these, to the *Jews* who *denied those of Jesus Christ*. I have often been heartily grieved, at this method of proceeding, amongst those of your Party ; and am sorry to see that you will have your Share in it, that you care not what *Mischief* you do to Christianity in general, so you can but hope thereby, in any measure to cover your own Corruptions. This is not so sincere as were to be wished ; but it is so common, that it must needs prejudice such as have occasion to observe it, against you, and so must disserve, instead of promoting your Religion.

VIII. *Rest.* * *Can your Author prove that the Church of Rome admits of any false Miracles ?*

Vind. That she has done it formerly, and for a long time together, your *Legendary Histories*, and especially the *Historia Lombardica*, are abundant Evidence. And no longer since than in the last Age, how were the *Virgins* of † *Hall* and *Sichem* celebrated ; and their *Miracles* applauded, and admired, as if they had been true ? *Lipsius* has given us a particular account of them, and written with an air of seriousness, and plain dealing. And yet *Mr. Sheldon* who had been upon the spot, and made enquiry after them, assures us, || *tho' in his often travels in those Countries, he was very inquisitive, yet could he never meet with one Man or Woman, who could affirm himself to have been an Eye-witness of any one Miracle done either at Sichem, or at Hall.* And yet his Book bears date, at most not above Twelve Years after *Lipsius's*. And his Inquiries might be much sooner. Nevertheless I know not whether you will allow these, to pass amongst those *false Miracles, that have been de-*

* Pag. 63.

† Virg. Hallens. & Aspricoll.

|| *Survey of the Miracles of the Church of Rome* ch. 3. p. 46. rected ;

detected; tho' I believe you will not pretend, that any Miracles are now wrought at either of those places, or have been since *Lipsius's* time, and yet one would think the Images should have continued to have the same Virtue as before. But besides these, the Story of the *Lady's Chappel* at *Loretto*, must by no means be doubted of, that it was brought by Angels from *Nazareth* at several times, till they left it where it now is. And yet the bare Narrative of it, as we have it in * *Misson*, and others, is enough to give any one a surfeit of it. Now you will not pretend the Forgeries relating to this to have been *detected by the Church of Rome*, tho' they are so open and glaring, that others easily see through the whole Contrivance. But it is too profitable to be parted with, and therefore it is not worth while to insist any longer upon it. Yet if any desire to be fully informed of the Translation of this House from *Nazareth*, and the Evidence they have for it, and the many Miracles said to be wrought where it now stands, he may have his fill of them, in Bishop *Stillingsfleet's* second Discourse in *Vindication of his Protestant Grounds of Faith*. Ch. 3. p. 434, &c. together with divers other like Miracles, said to have been wrought in other Places, and by others of their Saints, *St. Francis*, *St. Dominick*, the *British* and *Irish* Saints, and others. Besides whom it were easy to refer to divers other Authors, who treat plentifully of this Subject, but that I think it needless.

Rest. VIII. † *Your Author laughs on still, and asks, is it the Head or the Body of the same Saint, that is shewn in different Churches? And I answer seriously, no. Two Cities in France, Amiens and St.*

* Lett. 20. *Nouv. Voy.* To. 1. p. 302, &c.

† *C. R.* p. 64.

Jean D'Angeli, *both pretend they have St. John Baptist's Head, but the Truth is they have Heads of Saints call'd John; so they are not mistaken in the thing; but they give them the same Name.*

Vind. Is this the best defence you can make for them? Here are two Heads, both said to belong to the same Saint, though both we are sure he could not have. And his Worshippers may be deceived, and most probably are in both Places; but in one of them we are sure they are? Only you think to bring them off, by pleading they are both the Heads of Saints call'd *John*. Admit this, they are not both his Head whose Name they bear; and so the Worshippers of one of them, must necessarily be guilty of Idolatry, in worshipping that for St. *John Baptist's* Head, which is not. But you say, *these are both Heads of Saints call'd John*. But how know you this? You have no more proof of their being the Heads of two *John's*, than of one and the same *John*. Again, supposing they were the Heads of two *John's*, how should I know these were both Saints, and so in your Opinion to be Worshipped. Here may be a mischievous Mistake, for ought appears to the contrary, like that of the supposed † Saints in the Catacumbs, who in reality were no Saints at all, some of them probably no Christians.

Rest. I said before, *this is no matter of Faith, and every one has free Liberty to think of it what he pleases.*

Vind. But it is matter of Worship; and I would be glad to hear how you will be able to bring off those, who pay their Devotions to both these Heads, when they know not which is the true Head of him they do design to Worship, but rather have reason to suspect that neither is.

† P. Mabillion sur le culte des Saints inconnus.

Rest. We know there may be Abuses amongst us.

Vind. And we know * there are, and that your Church is pleased upon some occasions to condemn them ; yet she does not † use all means possible to reform them, but too frequently, perfectly connives at, and perhaps encourages them.

Rest. As to the Book your Author refers to, intituled, the Devotions of the Church of Rome, it's an infamous Collection of scandalous Lies, and monstrous Misrepresentations, compiled by the Ignorance and Malice of some Man void of Honour and Conscience.

Vind. Here you are in a fit of Rage, which vents it self so indecently, and with such excess of Fury and ill Language, as was not to have been expected, either from a Scholar or a Gentleman. The Author of the *Devotions of the Church, of Rome* was known to be a Man of very good Learning, and well versed in the Writings of your Party, and the Devotions of your Church, perhaps much better than your self ; but you think you may make free with him, because he is Dead, and so not in a condition to vindicate himself. But his great fault was this, that he has charged your Church highly, and made out his Charge, which because you cannot confute, you therefore fall out with him, and treat his Memory in this vile abusive Manner : Which shews he has touched you to the Quick, so as to put you out of all Patience. But it cannot be helped, the Evidence is clear, and you cannot hope to get rid of it, and therefore endeavour to prejudice your Readers against it, by giving the Author hard Names. But enough of this ; and too much for you to answer.

* Id. p. 57. 59.

† Reponse à une Lettre de Dom. Jean Mabillon p. 4, &c.

Rest. * *What your Author says, that our common People put the Legends upon the Level with the Holy Scriptures, as having the same Foundation, is another notorious Calumny.*

Vind. What Reason have you for this Accusation?

IX. Rest. *Our Church proposes to her common People the Scriptures as divinely revealed, and incapable of Error, she proposes the Legends, as human History, capable of Corruptions and Mistakes.*

Vind. You charge our Author with saying *your common People put the Legends upon the Level with the Holy Scriptures.* And see what an Answer you return to this? You challenge him to shew any of them that do so; and if he should name any, I much question whether that would silence you, though he knew them ever so well. You appeal to your Friend as to his Knowledge of them; but do not stay for his Answer; and so we are never the better for this Inquiry. But now, suppose your Church does teach a distinction betwixt the Credit due to Legends and the Holy Scriptures, yet since they are Recorded by Men of Note and Character amongst you, as † *Melchior Canus* owns; are plentifully to be met with in your Ecclesiastical Historians; and are inserted into several of your Divine Offices, your *Breviaries*, *Hours*, *proper Offices of Saints*, and some of your old *Missals* too, as might easily be shewn; too great occasion is hereby given to the ordinary People to have an over-high Opinion of them. And whatsoever distinction your Church makes betwixt these and Scripture, this is no better Argument of the common People's understanding it, than your Catechism's || teaching that Pictures and Images are not to be

* C. R. p. 65.

† Loc. Theol. l. ii. c. 6.

‡ Par. 2, cap. 2. n. 18.

Prayed to, is of the common People's not Praying to them ; which I am very well assured they do, from such who have been Ear and Eye-witnesses of it.

Rest. As to what your Author adds ; we give no handle to *Atheists* or *Deists*, to render Scripture fabulous ; but he and his Conferers are guilty of this Crime.

Vind. And to support this your Charge against him, you take refuge amongst the Free-thinkers, and condemn, the learned Author of *Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, whose Book, I dare undertake to affirm, you can no more answer than you can Dr. Barrow of the *Supremacy*, or the *Devotions of the Church of Rome*, at which you are so outrageously Angry.

X. *Rest.* † He charges us with arguing in a Circle, in proving the Scriptures by the Church, and the Church by the Scriptures.

Vind. Whether this Charge does lie properly against your Church, I shall not stand at present to enquire. But as you have managed the Matter, pray give me leave to ask, how do you get out of this Circle ?

Rest. I say, a Circle is when one thing is proved by another, and so back again, to a Man who admits neither.

Vind. Now to apply this to a Heathen, or if you please to one of your Friends the Free-thinkers ; these it is plain admit neither, and how will your way of arguing with them ever help you out of this Circle ?

Rest. Pray tell us, what proof had we of the Church, before there were any Scripture Extant ?

Vind. The Sense and Experience of those, who know and conversed with our Blessed Saviour, and his Apostles, and other Disciples, who heard their

† C. R. p. 67.

Doctrine, and saw the numerous Miracles whereby it was confirmed.

Rest. Cannot the same Proof be employ'd now as well as then, to shew the true Church of Jesus Christ ?

Vind. Is this the best way to rid your self of your Circle? If so, I doubt you are in a way to tarry long enough in it ; and particularly upon two Accounts. Because you cannot raise those to Life who could prove that Primitive Original Church : And because if they were now living, they would find your Church to be so sadly degenerated from the Simplicity and Purity of the Gospel, that they would all unanimously testify against you, as not the true Church of Jesus Christ.

Rest. We never denied that all bottoms upon our own Reason.

Vind. How do you reconcile this to your teaching and recommending an * *Implicite Faith*. These two cannot consist together. But you take a singular liberty to contradict the Writers of your own Church, when you conceive it for your Interest.

Rest. † We think it inconsistent with the goodness of God, not to give us an infallible Guide to lead us in the right Way.

Vind. You will be chusing for your selves, and telling Almighty God what were proper for him to have done, as your Champion *Bellarmin* did before you. Who if my Memory does not grossly fail me, argues somewhere after the same manner that you do, in behalf of the *Roman* Infallibility ;

* Si rusticus circa articulos credat suo Episcopo proponenti aliquod dogma hæreticum, meretur in credendo. *Tolet Instruct Sacerd.* l. 4. c. 3. Non quomodo probet, sed quid dicat Ecclesia advertendum nobis est. *Stapleton. Princ. Doct. Fid.* l. 8. c. 9. Deus suis ministris, non secus ac sibi credi fidemq; adhiberi voluit. *Id.* c. 10.

† C. R. p. 68.

namely,

namely, that if God had not bestowed that Gift upon the Pope, he had not acted with common Discretion. *Aliter Deus non fuisset discretus.* But if you bethink your self, you will find this Argument prove every whit as well, that every particular Member of the Church ought to have been made Infallible, whereby to avoid all those Differences and Contests, you cannot deny to have often happened, even in your own pretended Infallible Church. If you please therefore, you may with at least as much Reason *think it inconsistent with the goodness of God*, not to make every Christian Man or Woman Infallible. But the Truth is, God of his infinite Wisdom and Goodness having given us an infallible Rule, the Holy Scriptures, which if duly attended to, *† are able to make a Man wise unto Salvation, through Faith which is in Christ Jesus*, let us but faithfully adhere to this Rule as the Primitive Christians did, and after their Example square our Conversations accordingly, and we shall not stand in need of an infallible Guide. And unless we do so, all the Infallibility in the World will not suffice to conduct us to Heaven. For which reason I can by no means understand, how *it is inconsistent with the Goodness of God* to leave us to the direction of this Rule, *without such an infallible Guide*, who was never Promised, either in the Old or New Testament; and who, if there were such an one, would be no more able to prevent, or silence all Heresy, or to cure all Divisions, than our Rule would do without him. Even the infallible Apostles themselves could not do it.

Rest. We take purely upon Revelation many things taught us, of the Nature, Power, Infinity, &c. of God.

† 2 Tim. 3. 15.

Vind. You believe these Divine Attributes, you say, *purely upon Revelation*. But I hope it is because you find Reason to believe such Revelation; otherwise though the Revelation be most true, your belief of it is most unreasonable. So that after all you must confess, that * such Belief is *bottomed upon your Reason*, unless you will acknowledge your self and your Party to believe without Reason. Which will not be for the credit of your Faith.

Rest. These Matters of pure Revelation, are no Objects of Reason.

Vind. I grant our shallow finite Reason can by no means comprehend what is infinite; but yet it is certain Reason, as imperfect and defective as it is, if hearkened to, will direct us, as it did *Plato* and *Socrates* and others amongst the Wisest of the Philosophers, to some conception of the Divine Attributes, as not being matters of *pure Revelation*, as you would have them to be; tho' much better known by it. And as to those other Doctrines of the Blessed Trinity in Unity, the Incarnation of the Son of God, the Resurrection of the Body, &c. which are matters of *pure Revelation*, tho' they are not properly Objects of our Reason, yet the Revelation that teaches them is. For I can never come to know that such Revelation is from God; and so to be believed, but upon the account of the Evidences it brings with it of it's Divine Original. And I can never come to understand these

* See what your own *Stapleton* says to this purpose. *Sine ullâ inquisitione & labore, veritatem omnem cognoscere, ad immediatam illam revelationem spectat, solis Prophetis & Apostolis propriam. — Non autem ad eorum successores, & Ecclesiæ Ministros qui eos secuti sunt. Alioqui frustra & synodi convocarentur, & rerum sacrarum studia atque exercitia susciperentur, pastores quoque in Ecclesiâ non vigilantes, sed in utramque aurem dormientes statuerentur, multaq; alia absurda consequerentur.* Princip. fid. Doctrinal. Demonstr. Controv. 4. l. 8. c. 14.

but by the help of my Reason ; nor exercise my Reason to nobler purposes than in Disquisitions of this Nature.

Rest. No People in the World use it more in proper Cases than we do.

Vind. Then pray Sir do not appropriate it to your selves, but allow us to use it too without blame.

Rest. Only we captivate it when it pretends to meddle with things beyond its reach.

Vind. That is to say, you allow the use of it, in pressing Persons to come over to your Communion, but not at all when entered into it. And for this weighty Cause, that if it should prove over-curious, and enquire into the nature of your Faith and Worship, it will soon discover you are not only Fallible, but have grossly and shamefully erred. Which is a Point that is not to be meddled with, and Reason is not to be heard when she touches upon it. The short of the matter is this. We are desirous to hearken to, and be guided by Reason and Revelation, which if hearken'd to, totally overthrow your Church's Pretension. You on the other hand, are for discarding both these in behalf of your pretended Infallible Guide, or at least for making them truckle to him. And which of us act most rationally in this Case, I could almost leave to your self, in your more serious Retirements to determine.

Rest. Your Author teaches, * that God has given us no other Guide, but our own Reason, with the Assistance of his Grace, to believe in himself.

Vind. That is to say, to believe his Being. This is all our Author could be supposed to mean by

* C. R. p. 70.

this Expression, and I dare say you do not deny it.

Rest. You see I have not denied it to be true.

Vind. What Exception then have you to it?

Rest. *Then we need no other Guide but our Reason, for those other Articles of our Creed, the Trinity, Incarnation, Resurrection, &c.*

Vind. Have you proved this Consequence?

Rest. No; But I hope you will grant it without proof.

Vind. Indeed but I shall not. And if I may be allowed to make use of my Reason, I will tell you why I cannot grant it, namely, because it is a false Consequence, that no way follows from his Position, and so neither hurts our Cause, nor helps yours. And now Sir, what is become of the Contradictions you so insultingly charge upon our Author?

Rest. * *I ask him, whether he believes with less assurance the Incarnation, Trinity, &c. upon the Authority of Scripture, than he believes a God upon his Reason?*

Vind. And what if he believes them equally? He believes the Being of a God, because his Reason tells him there must be, and is one, and that it is very foolish, as well as wicked to question it. And what other Evidence have you for this great Fundamental Truth? He believes the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and the Doctrines contain'd in them to be infallibly true, and in particular those relating to the *Incarnation, Trinity, &c.* because his Reason tells him, he has infallible Evidence for the Truth of the Revelation, and the true sense of it, wherein these Doctrines are contained. And by consequence he believes both the

Existence of God, and the truth of the Doctrines revealed by him with the same assurance. And what *Linceus* can see any harm in this, or any damage to Christianity? You may cry out against this Proceeding, but I am very sure you will never prove it to be erroneous. And after all your vain Boasts of Dr. *Tillotson* and Dr. *Stillingfleet* being routed, by your beloved your * *Incomparable* Author of *Sure-footing*, I must beg leave to tell you, the *Rational Account*, as well as the *Rule of Faith*, wants yet an Answer still, after all that has hitherto been said against them. But because I would not impose too great a Task upon you, I would only beg of you to try if you can confute only two Chapters in that *Account*: They are the fifth Chapter and the seventh of the first Part. And if you write no more till you have done this, to the satisfaction of Impartial Readers, I am satisfied we shall not hear of you again in haste. In the mean time I am amazed, that you should own your self, *not more assured of the Being of a God, than of your absurd Doctrine of Transubstantiation*. And let me tell you, Christianity and even natural Religion is very little beholden to you, for such an impious Profession as this is. And if this be the best way you have of bringing your selves out of your Circle, you had as good continue in it.

Rest. Well, let us proceed.

Vind. Your long † Flourish about the Salvation of the Heathens I let pass, as not at all to the

* For Roughness of Stile, Obscurity of Expression, vain Confidence and weakness of Argument, there are very few Writers, if so much as one, that may compare with this Author. And this is the only sense I know of, wherein he can be justly stiled *Incomparable*: He is incomparably unpleasing, unintelligible, and inconclusive.

† Pag. 72, &c.

Case of the Church of *England*, in which it is my Business to shew Salvation is much rather to be expected, than in yours of *Rome*. And the Case of the Heathens will not determine this Question, on either side.

Rest. This I must own. But let me ask, * *Does your Author think the holding of the Three Creeds, sufficient? If he does, then he thinks Presbyterians, &c. in a good State, tho' they be noted Schismaticks, and have no Ordinations nor Sacraments.*

Vind. Does he say any such thing?

Rest. He talks of † *Rage seen among the Zealots of our Church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the pale of their Communion; tho' with Christians, who hold the three antient Creeds, and have every thing essential to a Church, except what Rome has made so, viz. The Universal and Unlimited Sovereignty of her Bishop.*

Vind. Does this look like declaring it sufficient barely to hold the three Creeds?

Rest. I cannot say that.

Vind. Where then is the Sincerity of misrepresenting his Words, as if he had? Here he supposes the Churches spoken of, to have each of them every thing essential to a Church. And what then becomes of your flirt at him, as if he were pleading for such as he owns not to have these Essentials? Certainly whatever Society of Christians has every thing Essential to a Church, you cannot deny them with any shew of Reason to be a Church, whether others be so or not.

Rest. *That the Church of Rome has made the Unlimited Sovereignty of her Bishop essential to a Church, is most untrue.*

Vind. I am glad to hear this; because hence it

follows, that those that have all other *Essentials*, must be true Churches, tho' they do not own such an unlimited Sovereignty in the Pope, and by consequence tho' they do not own themselves his Subjects. And then it is to be hoped, we may come in time to some Accommodation. For which reason I must beg of you not to revoke this Acknowledgment.

Rest. As for the Cappadocian Bishop Firmilian, I hope your Author will not deny he maintained a wrong Cause, against St. Stephen; yet in all his furious Violence, he never questioned Pope Stephen's Authority.

Vind. I am no way concerned to engage in Firmilian's Dispute about Rebaptization. But I cannot think it a plain owning the Pope's Authority, that he expressly charges him with * *Inhumanity*, and *unworthy Behaviour*, with *Boldness* and *Insolence* and *Wickedness*, with *Breaking the Peace*, and *defaming the blessed Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul*, with *manifest Folly*, with *want of Zeal*, and *Shame*, with *Unskilfulness*, with *causing Strife and Contention in all Churches*, and with *great Sinfulness*. These are the Complements Firmilian bestows upon Pope Stephen; and if these be the best and most satisfactory signs he has given of his *not questioning Stephen's Authority*, we shall not envy you as many more of the same stamp, as you can desire.

XI. *Rest.* † I must own your Author has an excellent

* Per illius inhumanitatem — Non Stephanus beneficio & gratia digna commisit. Ne dum audacia & insolentia ejus meminimus, de rebus ab eo improbè gestis — Rumpens adversum vos pacem — Infamans Petrum & Paulum beatos Apostolos — Manifestam Stephani Stultitiam — Nullo adversus hæreticos zelo — Non pudet Stephanum hoc asserere — Qua imperitiâ — Lites & dissensiones quantas parasti per Ecclesias totius mundi? — Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti? *Inter B. Cypr. Epist. 75.*

† C. R. pag. 79.

method of dealing with all sorts of Adversaries ! When he has to do with Deists, then the Jews understood those Prophecies of the Messiah ; now he has to do with Papists, the Jews did not understand those Prophecies of the Messiah.

Vind. What a mighty Business is here for you to be so witty upon ? If the *Jews* some Ages before our Saviour, whilst they had the Prophets amongst them, understood the Texts referred to, of the *Messiah* ; how does it follow, that the common People, and even their Priests and *Rabbies* could not possibly understand them otherwise in the Time of our Saviour's Incarnation ? some Hundreds of Years after *Malachi*, who was called * **חֹתֵם הַנְּבִיאִים** the Seal, that is, the closing up or finishing of the Prophets, because the last of them. There is no Inconsistency at all in this, but both Assertions may very well be true, with respect to the different Times whereto what he says relates. And we are so little afraid of the *Detector's* knowing what is here said, that if you please, you have free Liberty to acquaint him with it, and lay your Heads together to make the best use of it, for the Benefit of your Cause and Party, that you can.

Rest. Your Author makes his silly Lord speak foolishly, and then confutes him with a Magisterial Air.

Vind. Here you enter upon a long Excursion concerning the *Jews*, and make some Reflection, not over-pertinent, upon our Author's Christianity demonstrated. Which not concerning our present Controversy with the Church of Rome, I leave it to the Author himself, who is sufficiently able to take you to task for it, cou'd he think it

* D. Kimchi in Resp. c. Judæos, apud Lipman in Nitzach. p. 200.

worth his while. I am sure I do not think it worth mine.

XII. *Rest.* Your Author speaking of private Judgments, says, * *It is all we have for the Belief of a God, or of Christ.*

Vind It is not to the Advantage of your Sincerity, that you did not add the next Words, † *and by your own Confession for the Choice of a Church?* What reason had you for concealing this Passage? No good one I am sure; only it was not for your purpose to recite it. You cannot deny that you allow of the Use of Reason, or private Judgment, call it whether you will, in getting People over to your Church, as I have noted before, but then they are to have nothing more to do with so dangerous a Weapon. You make a great Noise with the Notes of your Church, her pretended Antiquity, Universality, Visibility, Miracles, Prophecy, and what not; which is a plain Appeal to our Reason; and so long as you hope these may prevail private Judgment does very well. But when once the Prey is caught, the Business is now done, and away with your private Judgment; that, as I said, will be inquiring into the Corruptions of your Church, will take notice of their Disagreeableness to the Holy Scriptures, will put Men upon *trying the Spirits whether they be of God*, and so may disettle Persons, and make them seek out for another safer Communion. But now if I may use my own Reason in choosing of a Church, why not as well in inquiring whether that Church require nothing of me that is apparently sinful, either in Faith or Worship? Nothing can make a Difference in this Case, unless I can get into an infal-

* C. R. p. 88.

† C. S. p. 46.

lible Church, which is not to be hoped for in this World, where all Men are fallible ; and unless I can moreover be infallibly assured that I am so, which I can never be, without the Exercise of my own private Judgment, or Reason. But I have already said so much of this pretended Infallibility, that I need add nothing more concerning it here.

Rest. The *short* of what your Author says is this, * *we must trust to our private Judgment in every thing.*

Vind. And what Argument do you bring against this? He does not say you are to trust purely to this *private Judgment*, without using the best means of Information, such as Reading the Holy Scriptures, which your Reason teaches you are the Word of God, and therefore the Rule of our Faith ; an Enquiry into the Doctrines and Practices of the purer Times of Christianity, which may help your Judgment in many cases, to understand the true Sense of Scripture, and of which your Reason teaches you also to judge by the Help of Scripture ; the Judgment of your Ecclesiastical Superiors, to whom your Reason will direct you to pay a great Deference, tho' not intirely to resign up your self to it, &c. but only that as you make use of your Reason in all other Concerns of any Importance, so are you to do it more especially in what is of the greatest Concernment to you possible, the Eternal Salvation of your Soul. It is hard to conceive, that a Man should be obliged to act rationally in all other lesser Matters, as you cannot and will not deny, but must lay aside his Reason and be hurried on blindfold, where his infinitely greatest Interest is

at stake : And if you think you can prove the contrary, be pleased to do it.

Rest. How does this agree with what he says in the very next Answer, that there are many things which he takes purely upon Revelation, for his Reason could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them.

Vind. This is only an Answer *ad hominem*, and so his former Position might be nevertheless true, for its Disagreement with this. But if you please a little to consider, you will soon see they do not at all disagree. First, he says, *we must trust to our Reason in every thing*, and then, *there are many things he takes purely upon Revelation, for his Reason could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them.* This looks as if you were afraid of making use of your Reason ; otherwise you could hardly suffer your self to argue so weakly. For when he tells you, he takes *many things purely upon Revelation*, you cannot imagine he means, that he does not use his Reason in inquiring, both into the Certainty and the true Meaning of that Revelation. When he is once assured of both these, he may very safely rely upon the Revelation for the Truth of what it attests, tho' above the Comprehension of his Reason. But he must act very unreasonably, if he have not first satisfied himself in both these respects, which he cannot do, but by the Help of his Reason or private Judgment. And by consequence he might reasonably enough say, that he trusts to his Reason even in these Matters of pure Revelation ; which tho' his Reason could never find out of it self, yet could he never have known, whether they ought to be believ'd when discovered but by the Help of his Reason, teaching him that these Articles are thus revealed, and again, that whatsoever is thus revealed requires his undoubted Assent, even tho' above

above the Reach or Comprehension of his Reason, which unassisted by Divine Revelation could never have brought him to the Knowledge of them.

Rest. Your Author * acquaints us, that *the Effects of private Judgment are these, multiplicity of Sects and Opinions, perpetual Wranglings, inveterate Prejudices, Animosities, Strifes, &c.*

Vind. We are now got off from the Discourse we were upon, the *Case Stated*, which you undertook to answer. However, that you may not think your self neglected, I am content to follow you, and hear what you have to say farther of *private Judgment*. And I must acknowledge it is a sorrowful Consideration, that these are the too common Effects of the Abuse of Reason, not of Reason it self when duly attended to. But you cannot say, but he tells you of other worse Effects of an implicit Faith, which you did not think fit to relate, because you could not answer them. *The Question*, he tells you, † *will now remain, whether greater Mischiefs and Inconveniences, have befallen Mankind in the one way, or in the other, in following their private Judgment, or in submitting implicitly to Authority.* And he gives you this notable Instance of the Difference between them, that *private Judgment can never be so fatally mistaken, as in submitting to Authority, if it should judge wrong; because in all other Errors it may be set right again, by stronger Reasons being offered on the other side; but if a Man once resign his Reason, and give it up absolutely to Authority, there are no means left to retrieve him; if he has judged amiss in the Choice of such a Guide, whom he thinks to be infallible, he must then follow his Guide, tho' in all the wild Delusions that are possible, for he must examine no more;*

‡ *Christ. Demonstr. p. 181, 182.*

† *Pag. 185.*

his Principle is to go on blindfold ; he hath plucked out his Eyes, that he may see the better. But this not being proper to be told, it was therefore thought convenient to suppress it.

Rest. || I know it would be unreasonable to think there was nothing in the Nature of the infinite Being, which I did not comprehend. But I can't see how this proves that some things, which appear to be manifestly against Reason, are in the infinite Being ; for Example, that Three are One and One Three.

Vind. I confess I cannot see, no more I am sure can you, or any one else, how there being some things in the Nature of the infinite Being, which we cannot comprehend, should prove that there are some things in this infinite Being, that are manifestly against Reason. Nor do I know what you mean by talking at this rate. For I am fully convinced, there is nothing manifestly against Reason in the infinite Being, and that our Author does not say there is. And if there be nothing apparently against Reason in the Deity, that some things in it are to us incomprehensible, will never prove there is. This you must inevitably own.

Rest. I give you an Instance of it in the Trinity, namely, that Three are One, and One Three.

Vind. This I grant is above our Reason, as every thing relating to a Spirit is. We know nothing of an immaterial Being, but by its Effects and Operations, and what wonder then if we know not how Three of them may be in one ? and yet it may be nevertheless true that they are so. We cannot understand how our Souls move our Bodies, nor how they will, or judge, or remember, or rejoice, or grieve, &c. and yet it is not the less certain that they do so : Which shews

plainly that they have a Nature and Faculties that are above our Comprehension, but not that they are against Reason. And the Case is much the same as to the Incomprehensibility of the Divine Nature, which is owned to be above our Reason, but not being the proper Object of it, cannot be said to be against it, any more than Geometrical Demonstration can be said to be against the Reason of an ignorant, illiterate Rustick, who has no Notion of any thing relating to the Mathematicks. Such an one cannot comprehend the Three Angles of a Triangle to be equal to Two right ones, that Parallelograms having the same Base, and being between the same Parallels are equal, or any other the like Problem. All this is pure Jargon to him, and he knows no more of it, than a deaf Man does of Musick, or a blind Man of the Nature and Difference of Colours. Of which these are no more competent Judges, than a finite Understanding is of what is infinite, or one that converses always with Matter and Body, of what is immaterial and incorporeal. Whence it appears that our not comprehending the great Mystery of the Trinity in Unity, by no means argues any Inconsistency or Unreasonableness in it, but merely the Weakness and Shallowness of our own Capacities. Three in One cannot be in material Beings ; but that the Case is the same in relation to what is immaterial and spiritual, can never be made out. And to say that this Doctrine, tho' plainly revealed by Almighty God, is yet unreasonable, or in your own Words, * *that it appears to be manifestly against Reason*, you must allow to be apparent Blasphemy, till you can find out some gentler Term for it.

* C. R. pag. 90.

And here if I should turn your own Artillery upon you with a little Variation, and tell you, a Deist may laugh in his Sleeve, to hear such Reasons given (against, rather than) for our Mysteries ; and that this is not defending, but exposing Christianity, and every true Christian should look with Horror upon these Blasphemies against the Holy Trinity, I cannot imagine what you would be able to say for your self.

Rest. * Hitberto I believed your Author was an Enemy to the Socinians, and that he had an Orthodox Notion of the Holy Trinity ; I find now I have been mistaken, and according as he expresses his Belief of it, there is no Sandius, Brenius, Clendon, &c. in the World, but will readily subscribe to it.

Vind. You have a very aking Tooth at this Author, as if you had a mind to make him to be whatever he has written against. It is not long since you represented him, † as a Friend to Disloyalty, and a Lover of War and Bloodshed. Now he must needs be a Disciple of Socinus. And next possibly you will make a Papist of him, just as you please. But at present as to Socinianism let me tell you, when you have written half so much, and to such purpose, against that Heresy, as he has done, it will be time enough then for you to accuse, or me to vindicate him from this unjust Charge ; of which I dare say you do not in your Conscience believe him guilty.

Rest. He sticks at nothing to do all the Mischief he can.

Vind. He is extremely obliged to you for such a Character ! But pray how do you make it out.

Rest. He has heretofore defended Revelation against the Deists, Christianity against the Jews, and the

Trinity against the Socinians ; now in this Book he gives up Revelation, Christianity, the Trinity, all that he may distress Popery.

Vind. Since by your own Confession, he has done such excellent Service to our Religion, against these irreconcilable Enemies to it, as he has against others also, one would think you might have allowed him fair Quarter, if at last you had found him tripping. This not only Charity, but Equity would advise. But now if he is not guilty as you suppose, but what he says is capable of a fair Interpretation, what then will you say for your self? Yet I see not but his saying may be understood in a sound and inoffensive Sense, whether you think so or not. *Personal Actions*, says he, *are attributed to the Divine Three, therefore we call 'em Persons.* What can this mean but that there being Three *Hypostases*, or Subsistences, in the Divine Essence, whereto proper Personal Actions are attributed in Scripture, they are therefore called Persons? This is so natural a Sense of his Words, that you could not tell how to frame your vain Objection against it, but by changing the Words and then arguing against them, not as he has spoken them, but as you have put them into his Mouth. He says, they are *called* Persons because of their Personal Actions ; you, that you might seem to have some Exception to him, represent him as saying, *they are Persons only* because of these Personal Actions attributed to them. Again say you, *If they are called Persons only ad captum, and not that we should think it really so, then we must not think there are any real Persons in the Trinity.* Now here a little Ingenuity wou'd have directed you to read over his Words once more, before you had framed your Objection, and seen how little reason he had given for such an Interpretation.

terpretation, having expressly declared, * there did not come such a Thought into his Head, as Three Persons of Men. Whence you might have satisfied your self, when he says this Name is used *ad captum*, he means that it is in Condescension to our Capacities, and because we know not how to express our selves more clearly, that the Word *Person* is here used ; not that the Three *Hypostases* signified by that Name would not have been the same they are, whether called by that Name or not. Then say you, *we must not think there are any real Persons in the Trinity*, whereas he denies only such Persons as those of Men ; and such you cannot pretend to say they are. And now what becomes of your shameful Exclamations about execrable Blasphemy, and sticking at nothing to do you Mischief, giving up all that he may distress Popery ? I add farther, what if you cannot clear your self of having ventured to expose the very fundamental Articles of Religion, to serve your Cause, and so the Charge recoils upon your self ? This you have done too apparently, by setting your late Doctrine of Transubstantiation upon the same Foot with the Being of a God and all the Articles of the Creed, as if they had no better Foundation to support them, than that has. Than which you could not well contrive to do a greater Mischief to Christianity, this being as much as in you lies, to sap and undermine its very Foundation. Your next Section is too trifling to deserve our notice ; and the next after that not much better, where you are pleased to charge our Author with not being of St. *Augustin's* Religion.

Rest. † Your Author's Lord proposes a Deistical Question, which is a little puzzling. What Authority,

* C. S. pag. 48.

† C. R. pag. 93.

says the Deist, *have you to believe Scripture. No Authority, says your Author, it is Evidence, and not Authority, upon which my Belief of the Scriptures is founded.*

XIII. *Vind.* Hence you triumphantly infer St. *Augustin* and him to be of different Religions, but for what reason? St. *Augustin*, I grant, professes he * *would not believe the Gospel, but for the Authority of the Church.* But it will be hard to tell the Difference between them. Our Author believes upon Evidence convincing his Reason, not upon any other sort of Authority. St. *Augustin* believes upon the Authority of the Church, that is, of the Primitive, † not of the present Church, and not as || a Legislator, but as a Witness testifying the Gospel to be the same that was taught by our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles; which in my judgment, comes to the same thing. So that these Two may very well agree together, and be of the same Religion, notwithstanding your smart Observation to the contrary.

Rest. He says farther, *I believe the Scriptures and the Facts therein related, upon the same, and much stronger Evidence, than I have for believing there was such a Man as Alexander, or Cæsar, &c. or such a Town as Rome, or Constantinople, &c.*

* *Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret Autoritas. Cont. Ep. Man. Fundam. c. 5.*

† *So did Gerson, de Vit. Spirit. lect. 2. & Durandus l. 3. distinct. 24. quæst. 1. Tho. Waldens. Doctrinal. Antiq. Fid. l. 2. c. 21. Joh. Dried. de Eccl. script. & dogm. l. 4. c. 4. Du Pin, Dissert. prelimin. l. 2. ch. 1. §. 8.*

|| Ce n'est pas que l'Evangile tire en soi son Autorité de l'Eglise: il l'a de Dieu même, qui l'a revelé & inspiré. Mais on n'est seur de cette revelation, que par l'autorité de l'Eglise, qui nous apprend que c'est ce même Evangile qui a été écrite par les Apôtres. *Du Pin* ibid.

Vind. And can you find fault with this? You must be in a very peevish Humour if you do.

Rest. To this the Deist may easily reply, that the Scripture cannot be believed upon the same Evidence, much less a stronger; for no Man in his Senses ever denied there was such a Man as Alexander, &c. or that there is such a Town as Rome, &c. but thousands of learned Men have denied Scripture to be the Word of God.

Vind. I thought the Inquiry had been, whether full and unexceptionable Evidence had been to be believed; but it seems, according to you, the Usage the Scripture has met with from perverse and obstinate Men, is the true Standard of its Credibility. Let it be ever so undeniable in itself, if it has had the ill Fate to be denied, little regard is thenceforward to be had to it. This is a way of arguing somewhat peculiar to your self; and I will not contend with you about it, but leave it to the Reader to judge of it. Only this I would offer to his Consideration, that if the Opposition a Doctrine meets with, whether justly or unjustly, invalidates the Evidence alledged in its Defence, I am afraid the Case of your Church and its Doctrines is very bad, they having met with much greater Opposition, than the Holy Scripture has done. So that by this new invented Argument, all that you have been so long building is thrown down at one Stroke. I would also desire to be instructed, who those *thousands of learned Men* are, who have had the Hardiness to *deny the Scripture to be the Word of God*. If you mean the *Manichees*, or such other ancient Hereticks, or our modern *Quakers*, pray make the best you can of their Denial. If you know of any other Pretenders to Christianity that have done it, be so kind, as to let others know them too in your next Letter.

Rest. I

Rest. I believe it, *says your Author*, from the Nature of the Evidence, which makes it impossible to concert such a Lye; and to carry it on without being detected. *And yet your whole Reformation is grounded upon the Possibility of concerting such a Lye.*

Vind. How do you make that out? The Argument is very sound; but your Charge upon the Reformation needs good Proof.

Rest. Don't you declare that the Church of Rome concerted the Lye of Transubstantiation, and carried it on without being detected? Sure you cannot deny this.

Vind. I both can, and do deny it. In the first place I think this Instance not to be to the purpose, because there is a great difference betwixt mistaking the Sense of a Text of Scripture, and propagating that Mistake, which a Man may in many cases do honestly, and others may be undesignedly drawn into it; there is a great difference, I say, between the venting and propagating such a Mistake, and attesting to the truth of a Matter of Fact, which they that attest it know not to have been done, or a Writing which the Attesters know to be a Forgery. Honest and well-meaning Men may possibly be concerned in the one, but none but Knaves and Impostors can engage in the other. Upon which account the former may oftentimes prevail where the latter cannot. In the next place, I say, the erroneous Doctrine of Transubstantiation, was so far from being concerted, and carried on without Detection, that it met with great Opposition from time to time. For not only the Greek Church and several others in the Eastern Part of the World, were irreconcilable Enemies to it, as Mr. Claude has proved at

* Reponse à Monsieur Arnaud de la perpétuité de la Foy, &c.

large, but nearer home, it was opposed by **Bertram*, † *Rabanus Maurus*, || *Berengarius*, and ∴ others. It was detected and opposed, and tho' carried on with a high Hand, never had that universal Testimony given to it, that was to the Holy Scriptures. But you do not care what Hurt you do to them, so you can but think it subservient to your Design of supporting the Doctrines of your Party, how erroneous soever.

XIV. *Rest.* I have a great many Exceptions to make concerning the Canon of Scripture.

Vind. And I will answer them very briefly.

Rest. 1. *What Churches were the Gospels, the Acts, Hebrews, &c. sent to, and what Church kept carefully the Originals, and sent Copies of them to other Churches.* The Gospels and Acts not being designed for any particular Church, but for the Benefit of the Church in general, it is most likely, that where-ever the Originals were, Authentick and well attested Copies were dispersed over all Places where Christianity had obtained; which were a just Foundation for there being received into the Canon of Scripture. The Epistle to the *Hebrews*, if you will condescend to believe * *St. Chrysostome* and *Theodoret* † was written to the *Jews* especially that dwelt in *Judæa* and *Palestine*, tho' not to these only, but to the dispersed *Jews* also that

* De Corpore & Sanguine Domini. Vide etiam Prohibit. in indice Expurg. Madrit 1667. p. 98.

† Epist. ad Heribald. c. 33.

|| Apud Lanfranc. de Sacram. Eucharist.

∴ Lisle's *Saxon Monuments*, Bishop Cosin's *Hist. of Transubstantiation*, c. 7.

* Πῶς ὁ ἵσιν ἐπισέλλει; ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις καὶ Παλαιστίνῃ. Præfat. in Epist. ad Hebr.

† Vid. Oecumen. Arg. Ep. ad Hebr.

were Believers. And so it was like to be sufficiently known before the Canon came to be settled.

Rest. II. When an Epistle was sent to Corinth, every Member of that Church did not know the Apostles hand, &c.

Vind. Nor was it necessary that every one should. When a Bull, an Indulgence, a Pardon, or any thing of that nature comes hither from *Rome*, it is not held necessary that you in particular, nor many others should know the Hand it comes in. Yet I do not think you reckon your self obliged to slight and reject it upon that account. So at *Corinth* it was sufficient, that the proper Judges there were fully convinced the Epistles they received were the Genuine Writings of the Apostle whose Name they bare, and that from thence the Church in all other Parts were fully assured it was so. For if * *in the mouth of two or three Witnesses every Word shall be established*; how much more in the Mouth of a whole Church at once? Especially when we know not at this distance, what other Evidence the Apostle himself might have given of it in the several places, where he had gone Preaching the Gospel? But you want us now to tell all the grounds the Primitive Church had for the reception of this or any other part of Scripture. A very wise and reasonable Demand.

Rest. III. Since this Method was so sure, and the Originals were extant, why was the Canon not settled in the first Age?

Vind. You would not have it settled before it was all written; which was not till very near the end of the first Century. So that all its Parts could

* 2 Cor. 13. 1.

not be then generally known. It is sufficient they were afterwards all received, tho' not all immediately, there having been some Dispute about the Epistles of St. James and Jude, the second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of St. John, that to the Hebrews, and the Revelation. That there was so, was J. Toland's Objection before you. And one of his Answerers returns this Answer to it, which you may take also to your self. * "The
 "least we can make of this is, that the Majority
 "of Christians rejected those Writings, and that
 "too a long time. But Eusebius, from whom our
 "Author had his Intelligence, says otherwise, he
 "saith, those pieces are of the number τῶν ἀντι-
 "γορεύων, but withal γινώσκων τοῖς πολλοῖς, i. e. Gain-
 "said indeed by we know not whom; but received
 "by the Generality. Euseb. H. E. l. 3. c. 25. It seems
 "however they were rejected by some, and that
 "also a long time. I answer, they were all receiv-
 "ed as soon as the Churches had full Commu-
 "nication with one another, by the Convention
 "of Councils; which for small Books containing
 "nothing that is singular, was soon enough. And
 your own Mr. Du Pin † has considered this Ob-
 jection somewhat more largely; and tells us the
 sum of his Remarks is, that it was but a small num-
 ber of the Books of the New Testament, whose Autho-
 rity had been called in question, that there were but
 few Churches that doubted of them, and that their
 Doubt lasted not long. Which is I think a full An-
 swer to this Objection. But if any desire farther
 satisfaction concerning it, he may see this Point
 of the Canon of the New Testament thoroughly
 discussed in the forementioned Defence of the Canon

* Historical Account and Defence of the Canon of the New Testament. p. 82.

† Dissert. Prelim l. 2. c. 1. §. 9.

of the New Testament in answer to *Amyntor*, this Preliminary Discourse of Mr. Du Pin called in the English Translation his *Compleat History of the Canon and Writers of the Old and New Testament*; and in another most compleat Vindication of the New Testament, entituled, *The Canon of the New Testament vindicated, in answer to the Objections of J. T. in his Amyntor*; and written by the late admirably Learned Mr. *John Richardson* formerly a Fellow of *Emmanuel Colledge* in Cambridge. Here he may find this Point fully argued without the help of your Principles; yet to the clear Conviction of *Toland*, and the *Free-thinkers*, and your self together with them. Whereto give me leave to add that *Tertullian* * testifies the unquestionable, I may say the † Original Epistles of the Apostles, *ipsæ authenticæ litteræ eorum*, were read in their Churches in his time. And so they could have no pretence for doubting of their being what they were said to be. And of the Gospels *Irenæus* saith, they were delivered us || to the intent they might be the Ground and Pillar of our Faith. Such was the regard paid to the sacred Writings in those early times. And that they meet with a different treatment, from those of your Communion now, is a Blot you will never be able to wipe off.

Rest. IV. As the most part of the Disputes with the Antient Hereticks, was about the spuriousness and genuineness of the Scriptures; if the Originals had been

* De Præscript. hæret. c. 36.

† *Authenticas*, inquit *Quintinus*, *litteras Apostolorum vocat. Apostolorum manu Scriptas, aut Subscriptas, ut ab Ulpiano dicuntur authenticæ tabulæ, authenticæ rationes, authenticum Testamentum*; quod distinguitur ab exemplo testamenti, l. 4. F. Fa. ercisc. lib. ult. F. de Testament. Vulgus appellat Originalia, &c. *Pamel.* in loc.

|| Adv. hæres. l. 3. c. 1.

extant, the producing of 'em would have ended the Dispute, without any more ado.

Vind. Will you undertake for this? Are you so fond of the Antient Hereticks, and Antiscripturists, as that you will take upon you to be their Compurgator? Or dare you answer for them, that they all knew the Hands of the Evangelists and Apostles so perfectly, as that a sight hereof would have presently silenced them? I cannot possibly think you believe this. And therefore I shall not take pains to confute it. But as *Abraham* said in another case, concerning the rich Man's Five Brethren whom he had left behind him upon Earth, * *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded, though one rose from the Dead; so shall I say of these Disputers.* If they would not be convinced by such Evidence as had satisfied the Universality of truer and better Christians, neither would they have owned their Error, tho' even the Originals of the Scripture had been laid before them. And for any thing you know to the contrary this Trial might have been actually made of a great part at least of them, tho' without your supposed success.

Rest. V. St. *Ignatius* in *Ep. ad Philad.* seems to be of a contrary Opinion to yours; as also was Mr. *Dodwell*, and perhaps *Eusebius* too.

Vind. As to St. *Ignatius*, you must change his Word ἀρχαίους into ἀρχαίοις, and without the Authority of any MS. to warrant it, before you can make it bend at all to your purpose. Nor will this do neither, for supposing such an alteration made, I cannot imagine how this will shew that truly Primitive Bishop and Martyr, to be in any wise of a contrary Opinion to ours. And you have

* St. Lu. 16. 31.

not been pleased to tell us, how we might find it out. Mr. *Dodwell* was a Man of great Learning and Piety ; but *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus* ; You know we did not believe him Infallible. And though the severe Persecutions the Christians were exposed to might possibly occasion the original Scriptures to be more concealed, than otherwise they would have been, yet it must be owned the Copies of them were dispersed amongst the Christians, as appears from the frequent Expressions taken from them by the Writers of those times, tho' perhaps without naming the Authors from whom they had them ; and were most of them owned as the true and genuine Works of the Evangelists and Apostles, whose Name they now have ; and consequently as Canonical and undoubted Scripture ; it being *morally impossible*, as Mr. *Richardson* well argues, * to suppose, that Pieces wrote, or authorised by the Apostles, should not be esteemed Canonical or Rules of Faith by all Christians, to whom they were communicated, since the knowledge which they had of the Doctrine of Faith, was entirely derived from them and their Instructions. Eusebius, as you say, complains of the Artemonists, for corrupting the Scriptures then received, but you add, he has not one word of the first Originals of the Apostles, nor says the Hereticks were brought to this Test. Yet it is certain he says, they adulterated the plain and sincere Faith of the sacred Writings. Which plainly implies that they had those Holy Writings, such as were known to be so, and perhaps the Originals themselves, if they desired to see them. So that these three Authorities all leave you, just where you was before.

* Can. of N. T. vindicated p. 87.

Rest. Suppose the Originals were then extant, might not Christians have conspired, to say they were divinely inspired.

Vind. To shew your great Zeal for Christianity, you are still arguing for the *Deists*; and * if your Religion teach you this, it must needs be a wicked one; for otherwise it would never put you upon studying to explode Divine Revelation, and represent it all as a trick and imposture. But that the Scriptures were written by Divine Inspiration has been so often proved, against the Antiscripturists, that I shall not now enter upon a farther Proof of it, here in the end of this Dialogue, but leave the Reader to consult some of the many Authors who have written upon this Subject, and amongst others the two forementioned Answerers to *Amyntor*, who have so worthily taken pains to clear this Point. Especially since this is no part of the Controversy I design'd to engage in, namely of the matters in Dispute betwixt the Church of England and that of Rome.

XV. *Rest.* * Remember Sir I have answered your Author's Objections, against the Infallibility of the Church.

Vind. The Infallibility of your Church is a Trojan Horse, that has a whole Army of Delusions in it, whereby it prepares it's Votaries to swallow all sort of Corruptions without Chewing; as Experience sadly testifies. But pray Sir remember on the other hand, that I have inquired into your

* When the Romish Orders do thus Argue *pro* and *con*, there is appointed one of the Learned of those Convents to take Notes and to judge: And as he finds their Fancies, whether for *Presbytery*, *Independency*, *Anabaptism*, *Atheism*, so accordingly they be to Act, and to exercise their Wits. *Bishop Bramhal to Primate Usher. Let. 293.*

† C. R. p. 97.

bold Pretences to it, and shewn them to be all Groundless and Precarious, and what you can never Maintain ; that you have no Foundation for them in Scripture, that your Reasons for them are insufficient, and that your Errors and Corruptions are an irrefragable Confutation of them. I have noted also that you are far from being infallibly agreed amongst your selves, where this pretended Infallibility is seated, whether in the Church Diffusive, or Representative, and if in the latter, whether in the Pope alone, the Pope and his Cardinals, a Council alone, or a Council only when confirmed by the Pope. Nor was it known to Primitive Antiquity, any more than it is to us. And moreover had you really any such mighty Privilege, which from the foregoing Considerations it is certain you have not, it would yet be of no advantage to far the greatest part of your Church, unless their Priests who are to instruct them, were each of them Infallible, which, after all your Boasts in this kind, you cannot pretend. So that in my Opinion you had much better have let alone this Brag, of having proved your Infallibility, when I have shewn so plainly, that you neither have, nor can prove it. But big Words many times do Business ; and you are resolved to try what use you can make of them. *This alone you say is a compleat Answer to our Authors whole Book, being no less than Demonstration.* But all I can find it *Demonstrates*, is only that you are willing to beg the Question, and then try what Superstructures you can build upon it. But pray Sir remember the Danger of building upon a sandy Foundation, lest your Building fall and bury you in it's Ruins. Infallibility is too high a Claim to be granted you without good Proof ; for want of which, your falsely pretended Infallible Church's Condemnation of our Author's Book, will do it

no

no manner of harm. Yet upon this false Pretence you seem to value your self, as if all Opponents, though with ever so much Reason on their side, must presently fall before you. It is but getting your pretended Infalible Church, to pass her Censure upon them, which she is ready to do upon all Occasions, and the Business is done. This were an easy Conquest, if there were any thing in it; but as the Case now stands I am apt to think, you will meet with few of your Adversaries so weak, as to be affrighted with such a *Brutum fulmen*, such a harmless Crack as this is.

XVI. To conclude I am now pretty well tired with this long Conversation; and shall not stand to take notice of your witty Flourish, upon our *petty Scriblers* and their *Objections*. But I must not wholly pass by your Complaint of not being permitted to Print on your side; whereas you actually do it, and this Letter now before me is full Proof against you, together with several other Books I could name, that you can Print upon Occasion. Only because you do it by Connivance, and not with publick License, this serves for a Pretence for not having answered such Books as none of you could answer when you had the greatest freedom of doing it, as I have already told you. For my own part, I heartily wish our Superiors would think fit to let you loose to write as you please, having learnt from the Experience we had formerly of your performances in this kind that you would do your own Business most effectually. And if you cannot make good your Pretences by Writing, upon Study and Deliberation, I take it for granted you cannot hope to do it better by a verbal Conference, which you seem to offer at, but I am confident you would find out some pretence to decline it, were your Challenge accepted. You may, and I do not doubt but you have a very good
Opinion

Opinion of your own Ability ; but pray Sir remember, when there was a solemn Debate of this Nature, before some of the greatest Persons of the Kingdom, who they were that got the Victory to such a Degree, that they were ordered not to give an Account of what had passed. I would not go about to lessen your Skill in Controversy, or in any wise to disparage you, but I hope I may say without Offence, that you are hardly better qualified for such an Engagement, than those who were chosen for that solemn Debate; which yet succeeded so ill on your side. The fault was not in the Advocates, but in the Cause they had undertaken to maintain ; and since that still remains, how ingenious soever you may be, it would be no ill Advice to you, to consider before-hand, and take warning by them. Thus Sir I release you at present, begging Pardon for the trouble I have hitherto given you ; and not designing to interrupt your Studies any farther, till you shall think fit to give occasion for it by a second Letter.

Your Humble Servant

Feb. 27.

Philalethes.

E R R A T A.

PAge 3 l. 10 r. any Harm. p. 9 l. 32. for the r. that
p. 29 l. 16 r. and Socrates. p. 89 l. 13. d. VIII.

THE CONTENTS.

I <i>Introduction</i>	pag. 3
I. <i>No Danger of Salvation from any thing in the Church of England.</i>	pag. 4
II. <i>Rome not the Mother Church</i>	pag. 5
III. <i>The Roman Pretences to an universal Su- premacy.</i>	pag. 6
<i>No Promise of this in Scripture</i>	ibid.
<i>Nor does it belong to the Church, by Virtue of the Pope's Succession to St. Peter</i>	pag. 7
<i>Scriptures silence an Argument against it</i>	pag. 9
<i>What Supremacy the Popes claim</i>	pag. 10
<i>Thou art Peter, &c. no Proof of it</i>	pag. 12
<i>Nor was so understood by the Fathers</i>	pag. 13
<i>In what Sense the Church may be said to be built upon St. Peter</i>	pag. 19
<i>A Recapitulation of the foregoing Pages</i>	pag. 20
<i>Of our Saviour's Command to feed his Sheep and Lambs</i>	pag. 21
<i>St. Peter sent by the Apostles to Samaria</i>	p. 24
<i>St. Paul withstood him to the Face.</i>	pag. 25
<i>A Mistake about Jethro</i>	pag. 27
<i>Of Joab's withstanding David</i>	ibid.
<i>And</i>	

The CONTENTS.

<i>And St. John Baptist withstanding Herod</i>	p. 28
<i>What Proof that the Heathens were convinced of the Christians believing St. Peter's Supremacy</i>	ibid.
<i>The Care of all the Churches was upon St. Paul</i>	pag. 30
<i>Some Passages out of the Acts of the Apostles, considered</i>	pag. 35
<i>The Council at Jerusalem bears no Testimony to St. Peter's Supremacy</i>	pag. 36
<i>St. Peter's supposed Supremacy, no Proof that the Pope is Supreme.</i>	pag. 41
<i>Besides we have good Evidence against this Pretence</i>	pag. 44
<i>The Testimonies of Prosper and Leo considered</i>	pag. 50
IV. <i>Of the Unity of the Church</i>	pag. 54
<i>Whether the Council of Trent has taught new Articles of Faith</i>	pag. 59
<i>Whether the Sacraments are a Part of our Faith</i>	pag. 61
<i>Of our Sects and Divisions</i>	ibid.
V. <i>Of the Greek Church</i>	pag. 63
<i>Of the Original and Progress of the Romish Innovations</i>	pag. 64
<i>Whether the Greeks owned the Roman Supremacy?</i>	pag. 66
<i>Of Appeals to Rome</i>	pag. 70
VI. <i>Their pretended Infallibility</i>	pag. 76
<i>Whether the Jewish Church erred in their Doctrine</i>	ibid.
<i>By the Church of Rome meant all in Communion with the Roman Diocese</i>	pag. 78
	God's

The CONTENTS.

<i>God's Promises never fail, where the Condition implied is observed</i>	pag. 79
<i>The Church of Rome not Infallible</i>	pag. 81
<i>Nor would it's Infallibility be of such universal Influence as they pretended</i>	pag. 85
VII. <i>The Miracles of the Church of Rome</i>	p. 88
VIII. <i>Of their Reliques</i>	pag. 90
<i>The Reflections on the Devotions of the Church of Rome</i>	pag. 92
IX. <i>The Romish Legends</i>	pag. 93
X. <i>Our Authors Charge of the Romanists Arguing in a Circle</i>	pag. 94
<i>Of Implicit Faith</i>	pag. 95
<i>Of the necessity of an Infallible Guide</i>	ibid.
<i>The use of Reason in Matters of Religion</i>	p. 96
XI. <i>Whether the Jews understood the Prophecies of the Messiah</i>	pag. 102
XII. <i>Of Private Judgment</i>	pag. 104
<i>Effects ascribed to it</i>	pag. 107
<i>Mr. L. no Favourer of the Socinians</i>	pag. 110
XIII. <i>The Foundation of our Belief of the Scripture</i>	pag. 112
XIV. <i>Of the Canon of Scripture</i>	pag. 116
XV. <i>Objections against the Romish Infallibility</i>	pag. 122
XVI. <i>The Conclusion</i>	pag. 124



The CONTENTS.

<i>God's Promises never fail, where the Condition implied is observed</i>	pag. 79
<i>The Church of Rome not Infallible</i>	pag. 81
<i>Nor would it's Infallibility be of such universal Influence as they pretended</i>	pag. 85
VII. <i>The Miracles of the Church of Rome</i>	p. 88
VIII. <i>Of their Reliques</i>	pag. 90
<i>The Reflections on the Devotions of the Church of Rome</i>	pag. 92
IX. <i>The Romish Legends</i>	pag. 93
X. <i>Our Authors Charge of the Romanists Arguing in a Circle</i>	pag. 94
<i>Of Implicit Faith</i>	pag. 95
<i>Of the necessity of an Infallible Guide</i>	ibid.
<i>The use of Reason in Matters of Religion</i>	p. 96
XI. <i>Whether the Jews understood the Prophecies of the Messiah</i>	pag. 102
XII. <i>Of Private Judgment</i>	pag. 104
<i>Effects ascribed to it</i>	pag. 107
<i>Mr. L. no Favourer of the Socinians</i>	pag. 110
XIII. <i>The Foundation of our Belief of the Scripture</i>	pag. 112
XIV. <i>Of the Canon of Scripture</i>	pag. 116
XV. <i>Objections against the Romish Infallibility</i>	pag. 122
XVI. <i>The Conclusion</i>	pag. 124

The case truly stated wherein the Case Restated is fully considered

London 1714

Polem. 491 h#Beibd.2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10772821-4